JANUARY 21, 2021

Re: SpaceX proposal to conduct Starship/Super Heavy launch operations from the Boca Chica Launch Site in Cameron County, Texas.

I urge the FAA to conduct a new EIS for the SpaceX Starship/Super Heavy operations currently underway at SpaceX's Boca Chica site. From the 2014 FEIS, the objective of SpaceX's operations are entirely different, the launch vehicle is entirely different, and the size and scope of SpaceX is entirely different, which potentially in the future may include off-shore launches via superheavy-class spaceports, Superheavy re-landing on the launch stand, and a resort.

An EIS is in the interest of the public's concern to impacts that include accessibility of public lands, public safety, environment, wildlife, habitat, cumulative analysis of impacts, the unique characteristics of the geographic area (e.g., proximity to historic or cultural resources, parks, prime farmlands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers, ecologically critical areas, adverse impacts on endangered or threatened species or critical habitat; impacts that may be both beneficial and adverse. A significant impact may exist even if the Federal agency believes that on balance the impact will be beneficial; the degree to which the effects on the quality of the human environment are likely to be highly controversial; and whether the action is related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant impacts. Significance cannot be avoided by terming an action temporary or by breaking it down into component parts. An EIS most probably will more adequately address the differences and changes to SpaceX's operations. Ultimately, an EIS is needed to predict and mitigate anticipated consequences and prevent unintended consequences of SpaceX's proposals of the Starship program on the region of influence.

FAA should consider not just the "proposed project" and "no action" alternatives, but also other alternatives that include launches of Starship from an offshore platform or moving Starship launches to Cape Canaveral, for which the necessary infrastructure already exists and is situated further away from national wildlife refuge and/or state park land.

A new cumulative analysis needs to be conducted. A 3rd party launch failure analysis is needed due to the proximity of Port Isabel, Long Island Village and potentially three LNG export terminals (Annova LNG, Rio Grande LNG, Texas LNG) within 5 miles of the launch site. Public safety must be the first and foremost consideration. Additionally, an analysis of the potential impacts to the proposed Jupiter LLC project, a crude upgrading, processing and export facility which includes an offshore loading facility 6 miles offshore. The cumulative analysis should also include impacts to climate change with regards to the value chain of SpaceX's operations (e.g. source of methane which is often fracked, condensing methane to liquid state, burning of fuels, etc.)

Considering the many changes since 2014, a 7 year period, and the scope of the Starship program, a new biological opinion is needed. The Starship is much larger, there will be more testing, more beach closures, and more traffic to SpaceX's facilities that are in an area where endangered wildlife is present. More closures of Boca Chica beach will result in increased inaccessibility to monitoring of endangered sea turtle nesting sites.

Since the Federal Aviation Administration already sent notice of preparing an EA, and if the FAA concludes a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) we request that the agency identify relevant areas of environmental concern, verify that EA supports the agency's determination that the potential impacts will be insignificant, and most importantly, identify mitigation measures that will be sufficient to reduce potential impacts below applicable significance thresholds and has ensured commitments to implement these measures. In other words, a Mitigated FONSI should be issued by the responsible FAA official. Additionally, I request the FAA enforce and/or hold SpaceX accountable to their required mitigation. Not all original 29 conditions from the EIS of 2014 were adhered to by SpaceX.

As a resident of Brownsville my entire life, I believe we deserve a new cumulative analysis in our area. Elon Musk once said in an interview that if a ship failed he wasn't worried since no people lived near by, he was certainly wrong. We live here and deserve consideration of our environment and health. We can't allow outside people destroy our homes. I ask that we be given the right of a healthy environment to live in for ourselves and future generations.

Claudia Hernandez
Brownville, TX

JANUARY 21, 2021

Re: SpaceX proposal to conduct Starship/Super Heavy launch operations from the Boca Chica Launch Site in Cameron County, Texas.

Greetings,

I urge the FAA to conduct a new EIS for the SpaceX Starship/Super Heavy operations currently underway at SpaceX's Boca Chica site. From the 2014 FEIS, the objective of SpaceX's operations are entirely different, the launch vehicle is entirely different, and the size and scope of SpaceX is entirely different, which potentially in the future may include off-shore launches via superheavy-class spaceports, Superheavy re-landing on the launch stand, and a resort.

An EIS is in the interest of the public's concern to impacts that include accessibility of public lands, public safety, environment, wildlife, habitat, cumulative analysis of impacts, the unique characteristics of the geographic area (e.g., proximity to historic or cultural resources, parks, prime farmlands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers, ecologically critical areas, adverse impacts on endangered or threatened species or critical habitat; impacts that may be both beneficial and adverse. A significant impact may exist even if the Federal agency believes that on balance the impact will be beneficial; the degree to which the effects on the quality of the human environment are likely to be highly controversial; and whether the action is related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant impacts. Significance cannot be avoided by terming an action temporary or by breaking it down into component parts. An EIS most probably will more adequately address the differences and changes to SpaceX's operations. Ultimately, an EIS is needed to predict and mitigate anticipated consequences and prevent unintended consequences of SpaceX's proposals of the Starship program on the region of influence.

FAA should consider not just the "proposed project" and "no action" alternatives, but also other alternatives that include launches of Starship from an offshore platform or moving Starship launches to Cape Canaveral, for which the necessary infrastructure already exists and is situated further away from national wildlife refuge and/or state park land.

A new cumulative analysis needs to be conducted. A 3rd party launch failure analysis is needed due to the proximity of Port Isabel, Long Island Village and potentially three LNG export terminals (Annova LNG, Rio Grande LNG, Texas LNG) within 5 miles of the launch site. Public safety must be the first and foremost consideration. Additionally, an analysis of the potential impacts to the proposed Jupiter LLC project, a crude upgrading, processing and export facility which includes an offshore loading facility 6 miles offshore. The cumulative analysis should also include impacts to climate change with regards to the value chain of SpaceX's operations (e.g. source of methane which is often fracked, condensing methane to liquid state, burning of fuels, etc.)

Considering the many changes since 2014, a 7 year period, and the scope of the Starship program, a new biological opinion is needed. The Starship is much larger, there will be more testing, more beach closures, and more traffic to SpaceX's facilities that are in an area where endangered wildlife is present. More closures of Boca Chica beach will result in increased inaccessibility to monitoring of endangered sea turtle nesting sites.

Since the Federal Aviation Administration already sent notice of preparing an EA, and if the FAA concludes a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) we request that the agency identify relevant areas of environmental concern, verify that EA supports the agency's determination that the potential impacts will be insignificant, and most importantly, identify mitigation measures that will be sufficient to reduce potential impacts below applicable significance thresholds and has ensured commitments to implement these measures. In other words, a Mitigated FONSI should be issued by the responsible FAA official. Additionally, I request the FAA enforce and/or hold SpaceX accountable to their required mitigation. Not all original 29 conditions from the EIS of 2014 were adhered to by SpaceX.

Boca Chica Beach, South Padre Island and the entire Texas Coast provide habitat for so many animals and various creatures. Aside from this it is also home and a dear destination for so many people. As adjustments are being made in this project I hope and expect for the proper precautions to be made in order to maintain the environment of our Texas Gulf Coast.

Kind Regards,

Danielle Cole
Rockport, TX

JANUARY 21, 2021

Re: SpaceX proposal to conduct Starship/Super Heavy launch operations from the Boca Chica Launch Site in Cameron County, Texas.

I urge the FAA to conduct a new EIS for the SpaceX Starship/Super Heavy operations currently underway at SpaceX's Boca Chica site. From the 2014 FEIS, the objective of SpaceX's operations are entirely different, the launch vehicle is entirely different, and the size and scope of SpaceX is entirely different, which potentially in the future may include off-shore launches via superheavy-class spaceports, Superheavy re-landing on the launch stand, and a resort.

An EIS is in the interest of the public's concern to impacts that include accessibility of public lands, public safety, environment, wildlife, habitat, cumulative analysis of impacts, the unique characteristics of the geographic area (e.g., proximity to historic or cultural resources, parks, prime farmlands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers, ecologically critical areas, adverse impacts on endangered or threatened species or critical habitat; impacts that may be both beneficial and adverse. A significant impact may exist even if the Federal agency believes that on balance the impact will be beneficial; the degree to which the effects on the quality of the human environment are likely to be highly controversial; and whether the action is related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant impacts. Significance cannot be avoided by terming an action temporary or by breaking it down into component parts. An EIS most probably will more adequately address the differences and changes to SpaceX's operations. Ultimately, an EIS is needed to predict and mitigate anticipated consequences and prevent unintended consequences of SpaceX's proposals of the Starship program on the region of influence.

FAA should consider not just the "proposed project" and "no action" alternatives, but also other alternatives that include launches of Starship from an offshore platform or moving Starship launches to Cape Canaveral, for which the necessary infrastructure already exists and is situated further away from national wildlife refuge and/or state park land.

A new cumulative analysis needs to be conducted. A third party launch failure analysis is needed due to the proximity of Port Isabel, Long Island Village and potentially three LNG export terminals (Annova LNG, Rio Grande LNG, Texas LNG) within 5 miles of the launch site. Public safety must be

the first and foremost consideration. Additionally, an analysis of the potential impacts to the proposed Jupiter LLC project, a crude upgrading, processing and export facility which includes an offshore loading facility 6 miles offshore. The cumulative analysis should also include impacts to climate change with regards to the value chain of SpaceX's operations (e.g. source of methane which is often fracked, condensing methane to liquid state, burning of fuels, etc.)

Considering the many changes in the 7 years since 2014, and the scope of the Starship program, a new biological opinion is needed. The Starship is much larger, so there will be more testing, more beach closures, and more traffic to SpaceX's facilities that are in an area where endangered wildlife is present. More closures of Boca Chica beach will result in increased inaccessibility to monitoring of endangered sea turtle nesting sites.

Since the Federal Aviation Administration already sent notice of preparing an EA, and if the FAA concludes a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) we request that the agency identify relevant areas of environmental concern, verify that EA supports the agency's determination that the potential impacts will be insignificant, and most importantly, identify mitigation measures that will be sufficient to reduce potential impacts below applicable significance thresholds and has ensured commitments to implement these measures. In other words, a Mitigated FONSI should be issued by the responsible FAA official. Additionally, I request the FAA enforce and/or hold SpaceX accountable to their required mitigation. Not all original 29 conditions from the EIS of 2014 were adhered to by SpaceX.

Greg Sells
Austin, TX

JANUARY 21, 2021

Re: SpaceX proposal to conduct Starship/Super Heavy launch operations from the Boca Chica Launch Site in Cameron County, Texas.

My family and I request the FAA to conduct a new EIS for the SpaceX Starship/Super Heavy operations currently underway at SpaceX's Boca Chica site.

As I understand it, the objective of SpaceX's operations are entirely different from the 2014 IES: the launch mechanism is different, the size of SpaceX is entirely different, which potentially in the future may include off-shore launches via superheavy-class spaceports, Superheavy re-landing on the launch stand, and a resort.

An EIS is in the interest of the public's concern to impacts that include accessibility of public lands, public safety, environment, wildlife, habitat, cumulative analysis of impacts, the unique characteristics of the geographic area (e.g., proximity to historic or cultural resources, parks, prime farmlands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers, ecologically critical areas, adverse impacts on endangered or threatened species or critical habitat; impacts that may be both beneficial and adverse. A significant impact may exist even if the Federal agency believes that on balance the impact will be beneficial; the degree to which the effects on the quality of the human environment are likely to be highly controversial; and whether the action is related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant impacts. Significance cannot be avoided by terming an action temporary or by breaking it down into component parts. An EIS most probably will more adequately address the differences and changes to SpaceX's operations. Ultimately, an EIS is needed to predict and mitigate anticipated consequences and prevent unintended consequences of SpaceX's proposals of the Starship program on the region of influence.

FAA should consider not just the "proposed project" and "no action" alternatives, but also other alternatives that include launches of Starship from an offshore platform or moving Starship launches to Cape Canaveral, for which the necessary infrastructure already exists and is situated further away from national wildlife refuge and/or state park land.

A new cumulative analysis needs to be conducted. A 3rd party launch failure analysis is needed due to the proximity of Port Isabel, Long Island Village and potentially three LNG export terminals (Annova LNG, Rio Grande LNG, Texas LNG) within 5 miles of the launch site. Public safety must be the first and foremost consideration. Additionally, an analysis of the potential impacts to the proposed Jupiter LLC project, a crude upgrading, processing and export facility which includes an offshore loading facility 6 miles offshore. The cumulative analysis should also include impacts to climate change with regards to the value chain of SpaceX's operations (e.g. source of methane which is often fracked, condensing methane to liquid state, burning of fuels, etc.)

Considering the many changes since 2014, a 7 year period, and the scope of the Starship program, a new biological opinion is needed. The Starship is much larger, there will be more testing, more beach closures, and more traffic to SpaceX's facilities that are in an area where endangered wildlife is present. More closures of Boca Chica beach will result in increased inaccessibility to monitoring of endangered sea turtle nesting sites.

Since the Federal Aviation Administration already sent notice of preparing an EA, and if the FAA concludes a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) we request that the agency identify relevant areas of environmental concern, verify that EA supports the agency's determination that the potential impacts will be insignificant, and most importantly, identify mitigation measures that will be sufficient to reduce potential impacts below applicable significance thresholds and has ensured commitments to implement these measures. In other words, a Mitigated FONSI should be issued by the responsible FAA official. Additionally, I request the FAA enforce and/or hold SpaceX accountable to their required mitigation. Not all original 29 conditions from the EIS of 2014 were adhered to by SpaceX.

James Seifert
Brownsville, TX

JANUARY 21, 2021

Re: SpaceX proposal to conduct Starship/Super Heavy launch operations from the Boca Chica Launch Site in Cameron County, Texas.

I urge the FAA to conduct a new EIS for the SpaceX Starship/Super Heavy operations currently underway at SpaceX's Boca Chica site. From the 2014 FEIS, the objective of SpaceX's operations are entirely different, the launch vehicle is entirely different, and the size and scope of SpaceX is entirely different, which potentially in the future may include off-shore launches via superheavy-class spaceports, Superheavy re-landing on the launch stand, and a resort.

An EIS is in the interest of the public's concern to impacts that include accessibility of public lands, public safety, environment, wildlife, habitat, cumulative analysis of impacts, the unique characteristics of the geographic area (e.g., proximity to historic or cultural resources, parks, prime farmlands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers, ecologically critical areas, adverse impacts on endangered or threatened species or critical habitat; impacts that may be both beneficial and adverse. A significant impact may exist even if the Federal agency believes that on balance the impact will be beneficial; the degree to which the effects on the quality of the human environment are likely to be highly controversial; and whether the action is related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant impacts. Significance cannot be avoided by terming an action temporary or by breaking it down into component parts. An EIS most probably will more adequately address the differences and changes to SpaceX's operations. Ultimately, an EIS is needed to predict and mitigate anticipated consequences and prevent unintended consequences of SpaceX's proposals of the Starship program on the region of influence.

FAA should consider not just the "proposed project" and "no action" alternatives, but also other alternatives that include launches of Starship from an offshore platform or moving Starship launches to Cape Canaveral, for which the necessary infrastructure already exists and is situated further away from national wildlife refuge and/or state park land.

A new cumulative analysis needs to be conducted. A 3rd party launch failure analysis is needed due to the proximity of Port Isabel, Long Island Village and potentially three LNG export terminals (Annova LNG, Rio Grande LNG, Texas LNG) within 5 miles of the launch site. Public safety must be

the first and foremost consideration. Additionally, an analysis of the potential impacts to the proposed Jupiter LLC project, a crude upgrading, processing and export facility which includes an offshore loading facility 6 miles offshore. The cumulative analysis should also include impacts to climate change with regards to the value chain of SpaceX's operations (e.g. source of methane which is often fracked, condensing methane to liquid state, burning of fuels, etc.)

Considering the many changes since 2014, a 7 year period, and the scope of the Starship program, a new biological opinion is needed. The Starship is much larger, there will be more testing, more beach closures, and more traffic to SpaceX's facilities that are in an area where endangered wildlife is present. More closures of Boca Chica beach will result in increased inaccessibility to monitoring of endangered sea turtle nesting sites.

Since the Federal Aviation Administration already sent notice of preparing an EA, and if the FAA concludes a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) we request that the agency identify relevant areas of environmental concern, verify that EA supports the agency's determination that the potential impacts will be insignificant, and most importantly, identify mitigation measures that will be sufficient to reduce potential impacts below applicable significance thresholds and has ensured commitments to implement these measures. In other words, a Mitigated FONSI should be issued by the responsible FAA official. Additionally, I request the FAA enforce and/or hold SpaceX accountable to their required mitigation. Not all original 29 conditions from the EIS of 2014 were adhered to by SpaceX.

I have spent much of my adult life dividing my time between our home in Kentucky, and my ancestral home in the Rio Grande Valley. Our valley base is in Laguna Vista, and my husband and I are considering a retirement in there, as he also has Texas ties.

Over the years, we have been delighted by the increase in environmental tourism in the valley. The flora and fauna in the RGV are truly a gift to us all and unique in the US. People come to the Valley from all over the world to enjoy natures gifts, the lovely climate, and the hospitable people.

Nature provides a huge economic engine for the Valley.

We have never understood why this experimental space base was allowed to be erected on such an environmentally sensitive site, where it could be decimated by the next hurricane or also easily destroyed by a terrorist attack from Mexico. As the recent launch demonstrates, even though many things go right, some things can go horribly wrong, as did the vehicle which exploded upon landing.

This company has several locations spread around the US. The Boca Chica site was a mistake from the start, and every permit involved should be reviewed. It is an environmental disaster, and an affront to the burgeoning tourist industry.

June de la Garza Dorsett
Lexington, Kentucky
Laguna Vista, Texas

JANUARY 21, 2021

Re: SpaceX proposal to conduct Starship/Super Heavy launch operations from the Boca Chica Launch Site in Cameron County, Texas.

I urge the FAA to conduct a new EIS for the SpaceX Starship/Super Heavy operations currently underway at SpaceX's Boca Chica site. From the 2014 FEIS, the objective of SpaceX's operations are entirely different, the launch vehicle is entirely different, and the size and scope of SpaceX is entirely different, which potentially in the future may include off-shore launches via superheavy-class spaceports, Superheavy re-landing on the launch stand, and a resort.

An EIS is in the interest of the public's concern to impacts that include accessibility of public lands, public safety, environment, wildlife, habitat, cumulative analysis of impacts, the unique characteristics of the geographic area (e.g., proximity to historic or cultural resources, parks, prime farmlands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers, ecologically critical areas, adverse impacts on endangered or threatened species or critical habitat; impacts that may be both beneficial and adverse. A significant impact may exist even if the Federal agency believes that on balance the impact will be beneficial; the degree to which the effects on the quality of the human environment are likely to be highly controversial; and whether the action is related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant impacts. Significance cannot be avoided by terming an action temporary or by breaking it down into component parts. An EIS most probably will more adequately address the differences and changes to SpaceX's operations. Ultimately, an EIS is needed to predict and mitigate anticipated consequences and prevent unintended consequences of SpaceX's proposals of the Starship program on the region of influence.

FAA should consider not just the "proposed project" and "no action" alternatives, but also other alternatives that include launches of Starship from an offshore platform or moving Starship launches to Cape Canaveral, for which the necessary infrastructure already exists and is situated further away from national wildlife refuge and/or state park land.

A new cumulative analysis needs to be conducted. A 3rd party launch failure analysis is needed due to the proximity of Port Isabel, Long Island Village and potentially three LNG export terminals (Annova LNG, Rio Grande LNG, Texas LNG) within 5 miles of the launch site. Public safety must be

the first and foremost consideration. Additionally, an analysis of the potential impacts to the proposed Jupiter LLC project, a crude upgrading, processing and export facility which includes an offshore loading facility 6 miles offshore. The cumulative analysis should also include impacts to climate change with regards to the value chain of SpaceX's operations (e.g. source of methane which is often fracked, condensing methane to liquid state, burning of fuels, etc.)

Considering the many changes since 2014, a 7 year period, and the scope of the Starship program, a new biological opinion is needed. The Starship is much larger, there will be more testing, more beach closures, and more traffic to SpaceX's facilities that are in an area where endangered wildlife is present. More closures of Boca Chica beach will result in increased inaccessibility to monitoring of endangered sea turtle nesting sites.

Since the Federal Aviation Administration already sent notice of preparing an EA, and if the FAA concludes a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) we request that the agency identify relevant areas of environmental concern, verify that EA supports the agency's determination that the potential impacts will be insignificant, and most importantly, identify mitigation measures that will be sufficient to reduce potential impacts below applicable significance thresholds and has ensured commitments to implement these measures. In other words, a Mitigated FONSI should be issued by the responsible FAA official. Additionally, I request the FAA enforce and/or hold SpaceX accountable to their required mitigation. Not all original 29 conditions from the EIS of 2014 were adhered to by SpaceX.

I have spent much of my adult life dividing my time between our home in Kentucky, and my ancestral home in the Rio Grande Valley. Our valley base is in Laguna Vista, and my husband and I are considering a retirement in there, as he also has Texas ties.

Over the years, we have been delighted by the increase in environmental tourism in the valley. The flora and fauna in the RGV are truly a gift to us all and unique in the US. People come to the Valley from all over the world to enjoy natures gifts, the lovely climate, and the hospitable people.

Nature provides a huge economic engine for the Valley.

We have never understood why this experimental space base was allowed to be erected on such an environmentally sensitive site, where it could be decimated by the next hurricane or also easily destroyed by a terrorist attack from Mexico. As the recent launch demonstrates, even though many things go right, some things can go horribly wrong, as did the vehicle which exploded upon landing.

This company has several locations spread around the US. The Boca Chica site was a mistake from the start, and every permit involved should be reviewed. It is an environmental disaster, and an affront to the burgeoning tourist industry.

June de la Garza Dorsett
Lexington, Kentucky
Laguna Vista, Texas

JANUARY 21, 2021

Re: SpaceX proposal to conduct Starship/Super Heavy launch operations from the Boca Chica Launch Site in Cameron County, Texas.

Dear Sirs and Madams,

I live on the Laguna Madre, a very special environmental body of water. Our region is special with the last clean beach in Texas, a migration path for many species and a plant and animal population that is unique and some endangered. This is an area long inhabited by native populations. And it is currently inhabited by many poor people of 'color' and retirees. Please take our special area into consideration while evaluating this proposal.

I urge the FAA to conduct a new EIS for the SpaceX Starship/Super Heavy operations currently underway at SpaceX's Boca Chica site. From the 2014 FEIS, the objective of SpaceX's operations are entirely different, the launch vehicle is entirely different, and the size and scope of SpaceX is entirely different, which potentially in the future may include off-shore launches via superheavy-class spaceports, Superheavy re-landing on the launch stand, and a resort.

An EIS is in the interest of the public's concern to impacts that include accessibility of public lands, public safety, environment, wildlife, habitat, cumulative analysis of impacts, the unique characteristics of the geographic area (e.g., proximity to historic or cultural resources, parks, prime farmlands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers, ecologically critical areas, adverse impacts on endangered or threatened species or critical habitat; impacts that may be both beneficial and adverse. A significant impact may exist even if the Federal agency believes that on balance the impact will be beneficial; the degree to which the effects on the quality of the human environment are likely to be highly controversial; and whether the action is related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant impacts. Significance cannot be avoided by terming an action temporary or by breaking it down into component parts. An EIS most probably will more adequately address the differences and changes to SpaceX's operations. Ultimately, an EIS is needed to predict and mitigate anticipated consequences and prevent unintended consequences of SpaceX's proposals of the Starship program on the region of influence.

FAA should consider not just the “proposed project” and “no action” alternatives, but also other alternatives that include launches of Starship from an offshore platform or moving Starship launches to Cape Canaveral, for which the necessary infrastructure already exists and is situated further away from national wildlife refuge and/or state park land.

A new cumulative analysis needs to be conducted. A 3rd party launch failure analysis is needed due to the proximity of Port Isabel, Long Island Village and potentially three LNG export terminals (Annova LNG, Rio Grande LNG, Texas LNG) within 5 miles of the launch site. Public safety must be the first and foremost consideration. Additionally, an analysis of the potential impacts to the proposed Jupiter LLC project, a crude upgrading, processing and export facility which includes an offshore loading facility 6 miles offshore. The cumulative analysis should also include impacts to climate change with regards to the value chain of SpaceX’s operations (e.g. source of methane which is often fracked, condensing methane to liquid state, burning of fuels, etc.)

Considering the many changes since 2014, a 7 year period, and the scope of the Starship program, a new biological opinion is needed. The Starship is much larger, there will be more testing, more beach closures, and more traffic to SpaceX’s facilities that are in an area where endangered wildlife is present. More closures of Boca Chica beach will result in increased inaccessibility to monitoring of endangered sea turtle nesting sites.

Since the Federal Aviation Administration already sent notice of preparing an EA, and if the FAA concludes a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) we request that the agency identify relevant areas of environmental concern, verify that EA supports the agency’s determination that the potential impacts will be insignificant, and most importantly, identify mitigation measures that will be sufficient to reduce potential impacts below applicable significance thresholds and has ensured commitments to implement these measures. In other words, a Mitigated FONSI should be issued by the responsible FAA official. Additionally, I request the FAA enforce and/or hold SpaceX accountable to their required mitigation. Not all original 29 conditions from the EIS of 2014 were adhered to by SpaceX.

Marianne Poythress
Laguna Vista, TX

JANUARY 21, 2021

Re: SpaceX proposal to conduct Starship/Super Heavy launch operations from the Boca Chica Launch Site in Cameron County, Texas.

I urge the FAA to conduct a new EIS for the SpaceX Starship/Super Heavy operations currently underway at SpaceX's Boca Chica site. From the 2014 FEIS, the objective of SpaceX's operations are entirely different, the launch vehicle is entirely different, and the size and scope of SpaceX is entirely different, which potentially in the future may include off-shore launches via superheavy-class spaceports, Superheavy re-landing on the launch stand, and a resort.

An EIS is in the interest of the public's concern to impacts that include accessibility of public lands, public safety, environment, wildlife, habitat, cumulative analysis of impacts, the unique characteristics of the geographic area (e.g., proximity to historic or cultural resources, parks, prime farmlands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers, ecologically critical areas, adverse impacts on endangered or threatened species or critical habitat; impacts that may be both beneficial and adverse. A significant impact may exist even if the Federal agency believes that on balance the impact will be beneficial; the degree to which the effects on the quality of the human environment are likely to be highly controversial; and whether the action is related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant impacts. Significance cannot be avoided by terming an action temporary or by breaking it down into component parts. An EIS most probably will more adequately address the differences and changes to SpaceX's operations. Ultimately, an EIS is needed to predict and mitigate anticipated consequences and prevent unintended consequences of SpaceX's proposals of the Starship program on the region of influence.

FAA should consider not just the "proposed project" and "no action" alternatives, but also other alternatives that include launches of Starship from an offshore platform or moving Starship launches to Cape Canaveral, for which the necessary infrastructure already exists and is situated further away from national wildlife refuge and/or state park land.

A new cumulative analysis needs to be conducted. A 3rd party launch failure analysis is needed due to the proximity of Port Isabel, Long Island Village and potentially three LNG export terminals (Annova LNG, Rio Grande LNG, Texas LNG) within 5 miles of the launch site. Public safety must be

the first and foremost consideration. Additionally, an analysis of the potential impacts to the proposed Jupiter LLC project, a crude upgrading, processing and export facility which includes an offshore loading facility 6 miles offshore. The cumulative analysis should also include impacts to climate change with regards to the value chain of SpaceX's operations (e.g. source of methane which is often fracked, condensing methane to liquid state, burning of fuels, etc.)

Considering the many changes since 2014, a 7 year period, and the scope of the Starship program, a new biological opinion is needed. The Starship is much larger, there will be more testing, more beach closures, and more traffic to SpaceX's facilities that are in an area where endangered wildlife is present. More closures of Boca Chica beach will result in increased inaccessibility to monitoring of endangered sea turtle nesting sites.

Since the Federal Aviation Administration already sent notice of preparing an EA, and if the FAA concludes a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) we request that the agency identify relevant areas of environmental concern, verify that EA supports the agency's determination that the potential impacts will be insignificant, and most importantly, identify mitigation measures that will be sufficient to reduce potential impacts below applicable significance thresholds and has ensured commitments to implement these measures. In other words, a Mitigated FONSI should be issued by the responsible FAA official. Additionally, I request the FAA enforce and/or hold SpaceX accountable to their required mitigation. Not all original 29 conditions from the EIS of 2014 were adhered to by SpaceX.

We have been cheering on SpaceX since at least 2014, when we started resisting the 3 unwise, wasteful, and deadly LNG plants planned for nearby sites along Rte. 48, between the Bahia Grande and the SpaceX areas near Boca Chica Beach. Why? Because we admire Elon Musk and his renewable energy cars, ... and other projects. However, live rocket fuel and the invisible Methane pool in the atmosphere just above the SpaceX sites. Having read accounts of the Chinese port explosion a few years ago, and having grown up in Cleveland, site of horrific natural gas accidents since my childhood, I am very concerned about a VCE, which would be deadly to everyone and everything within at least the ten mile radius of SpaceX and the LNG sites. Appalling! Please go ahead, and in the scope of the EIS, or even a thorough EA which shows DEFINITE SIGNIFICANT NEGATIVE Environmental impacts, PLEASE INCLUDE THE increased risk of deadly, catastrophic VCEs, and the economic and environmental harms that would be irremediable. Ocelot and Aplomado Falcon, rare sea grasses, oyster beds, Roseate Spoonbills, Brown Pelicans, and the new black rail which is listed as endangered, ... are highly vulnerable in this region, and surely more worthy of protection than a few wealthy oil barons wanting to use fracked gas to make LNG at minus 260 degrees C.

Thank you for taking this seriously, because it will be too late after the VCEs and another degree of global warming, methane causing deadly heat waves and crop failures, and general storm extremes which are sure to follow. YOU are responsible, and can help us stop the worst dangers related to LNG.

Best of luck and science in your launches, and blessings for the new year,

Dr. Sarah Bishop Merrill, M.S., Ph.D.
Harlingen, TX

JANUARY 21, 2021

Re: SpaceX proposal to conduct Starship/Super Heavy launch operations from the Boca Chica Launch Site in Cameron County, Texas.

The blast last Dec shook my house and rattled my windows so I'm not in favor of this proposal since cape canaveral already has the proper facilities in place. Thank you.

I urge the FAA to conduct a new EIS for the SpaceX Starship/Super Heavy operations currently underway at SpaceX's Boca Chica site. From the 2014 FEIS, the objective of SpaceX's operations are entirely different, the launch vehicle is entirely different, and the size and scope of SpaceX is entirely different, which potentially in the future may include off-shore launches via superheavy-class spaceports, Superheavy re-landing on the launch stand, and a resort.

An EIS is in the interest of the public's concern to impacts that include accessibility of public lands, public safety, environment, wildlife, habitat, cumulative analysis of impacts, the unique characteristics of the geographic area (e.g., proximity to historic or cultural resources, parks, prime farmlands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers, ecologically critical areas, adverse impacts on endangered or threatened species or critical habitat; impacts that may be both beneficial and adverse. A significant impact may exist even if the Federal agency believes that on balance the impact will be beneficial; the degree to which the effects on the quality of the human environment are likely to be highly controversial; and whether the action is related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant impacts. Significance cannot be avoided by terming an action temporary or by breaking it down into component parts. An EIS most probably will more adequately address the differences and changes to SpaceX's operations. Ultimately, an EIS is needed to predict and mitigate anticipated consequences and prevent unintended consequences of SpaceX's proposals of the Starship program on the region of influence.

FAA should consider not just the "proposed project" and "no action" alternatives, but also other alternatives that include launches of Starship from an offshore platform or moving Starship launches to Cape Canaveral, for which the necessary infrastructure already exists and is situated further away from national wildlife refuge and/or state park land.

A new cumulative analysis needs to be conducted. A 3rd party launch failure analysis is needed due to the proximity of Port Isabel, Long Island Village and potentially three LNG export terminals (Annova LNG, Rio Grande LNG, Texas LNG) within 5 miles of the launch site. Public safety must be the first and foremost consideration. Additionally, an analysis of the potential impacts to the proposed Jupiter LLC project, a crude upgrading, processing and export facility which includes an offshore loading facility 6 miles offshore. The cumulative analysis should also include impacts to climate change with regards to the value chain of SpaceX's operations (e.g. source of methane which is often fracked, condensing methane to liquid state, burning of fuels, etc.)

Considering the many changes since 2014, a 7 year period, and the scope of the Starship program, a new biological opinion is needed. The Starship is much larger, there will be more testing, more beach closures, and more traffic to SpaceX's facilities that are in an area where endangered wildlife is present. More closures of Boca Chica beach will result in increased inaccessibility to monitoring of endangered sea turtle nesting sites.

Since the Federal Aviation Administration already sent notice of preparing an EA, and if the FAA concludes a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) we request that the agency identify relevant areas of environmental concern, verify that EA supports the agency's determination that the potential impacts will be insignificant, and most importantly, identify mitigation measures that will be sufficient to reduce potential impacts below applicable significance thresholds and has ensured commitments to implement these measures. In other words, a Mitigated FONSI should be issued by the responsible FAA official. Additionally, I request the FAA enforce and/or hold SpaceX accountable to their required mitigation. Not all original 29 conditions from the EIS of 2014 were adhered to by SpaceX.

Victoria Scharen
Port Isabel, TX

JANUARY 21, 2021

Re: SpaceX proposal to conduct Starship/Super Heavy launch operations from the Boca Chica Launch Site in Cameron County, Texas.

I urge the FAA to conduct a new EIS for the SpaceX Starship/Super Heavy operations currently underway at SpaceX's Boca Chica site. From the 2014 FEIS, the objective of SpaceX's operations are entirely different, the launch vehicle is entirely different, and the size and scope of SpaceX is entirely different, which potentially in the future may include off-shore launches via superheavy-class spaceports, Superheavy re-landing on the launch stand, and a resort.

An EIS is in the interest of the public's concern to impacts that include accessibility of public lands, public safety, environment, wildlife, habitat, cumulative analysis of impacts, the unique characteristics of the geographic area (e.g., proximity to historic or cultural resources, parks, prime farmlands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers, ecologically critical areas, adverse impacts on endangered or threatened species or critical habitat; impacts that may be both beneficial and adverse. A significant impact may exist even if the Federal agency believes that on balance the impact will be beneficial; the degree to which the effects on the quality of the human environment are likely to be highly controversial; and whether the action is related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant impacts. Significance cannot be avoided by terming an action temporary or by breaking it down into component parts. An EIS most probably will more adequately address the differences and changes to SpaceX's operations. Ultimately, an EIS is needed to predict and mitigate anticipated consequences and prevent unintended consequences of SpaceX's proposals of the Starship program on the region of influence.

FAA should consider not just the "proposed project" and "no action" alternatives, but also other alternatives that include launches of Starship from an offshore platform or moving Starship launches to Cape Canaveral, for which the necessary infrastructure already exists and is situated further away from national wildlife refuge and/or state park land.

A new cumulative analysis needs to be conducted. A 3rd party launch failure analysis is needed due to the proximity of Port Isabel, Long Island Village and potentially three LNG export terminals (Annova LNG, Rio Grande LNG, Texas LNG) within 5 miles of the launch site. Public safety must be

the first and foremost consideration. Additionally, an analysis of the potential impacts to the proposed Jupiter LLC project, a crude upgrading, processing and export facility which includes an offshore loading facility 6 miles offshore. The cumulative analysis should also include impacts to climate change with regards to the value chain of SpaceX's operations (e.g. source of methane which is often fracked, condensing methane to liquid state, burning of fuels, etc.)

Considering the many changes since 2014, a 7 year period, and the scope of the Starship program, a new biological opinion is needed. The Starship is much larger, there will be more testing, more beach closures, and more traffic to SpaceX's facilities that are in an area where endangered wildlife is present. More closures of Boca Chica beach will result in increased inaccessibility to monitoring of endangered sea turtle nesting sites.

Since the Federal Aviation Administration already sent notice of preparing an EA, and if the FAA concludes a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) we request that the agency identify relevant areas of environmental concern, verify that EA supports the agency's determination that the potential impacts will be insignificant, and most importantly, identify mitigation measures that will be sufficient to reduce potential impacts below applicable significance thresholds and has ensured commitments to implement these measures. In other words, a Mitigated FONSI should be issued by the responsible FAA official. Additionally, I request the FAA enforce and/or hold SpaceX accountable to their required mitigation. Not all original 29 conditions from the EIS of 2014 were adhered to by SpaceX.

Adriana Chapa
San Juan, TX

JANUARY 21, 2021

Re: SpaceX proposal to conduct Starship/Super Heavy launch operations from the Boca Chica Launch Site in Cameron County, Texas.

I urge the FAA to conduct a new EIS for the SpaceX Starship/Super Heavy operations currently underway at SpaceX's Boca Chica site. From the 2014 FEIS, the objective of SpaceX's operations are entirely different, the launch vehicle is entirely different, and the size and scope of SpaceX is entirely different, which potentially in the future may include off-shore launches via superheavy-class spaceports, Superheavy re-landing on the launch stand, and a resort.

An EIS is in the interest of the public's concern to impacts that include accessibility of public lands, public safety, environment, wildlife, habitat, cumulative analysis of impacts, the unique characteristics of the geographic area (e.g., proximity to historic or cultural resources, parks, prime farmlands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers, ecologically critical areas, adverse impacts on endangered or threatened species or critical habitat; impacts that may be both beneficial and adverse. A significant impact may exist even if the Federal agency believes that on balance the impact will be beneficial; the degree to which the effects on the quality of the human environment are likely to be highly controversial; and whether the action is related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant impacts. Significance cannot be avoided by terming an action temporary or by breaking it down into component parts. An EIS most probably will more adequately address the differences and changes to SpaceX's operations. Ultimately, an EIS is needed to predict and mitigate anticipated consequences and prevent unintended consequences of SpaceX's proposals of the Starship program on the region of influence.

FAA should consider not just the "proposed project" and "no action" alternatives, but also other alternatives that include launches of Starship from an offshore platform or moving Starship launches to Cape Canaveral, for which the necessary infrastructure already exists and is situated further away from national wildlife refuge and/or state park land.

A new cumulative analysis needs to be conducted. A 3rd party launch failure analysis is needed due to the proximity of Port Isabel, Long Island Village and potentially three LNG export terminals (Annova LNG, Rio Grande LNG, Texas LNG) within 5 miles of the launch site. Public safety must be

the first and foremost consideration. Additionally, an analysis of the potential impacts to the proposed Jupiter LLC project, a crude upgrading, processing and export facility which includes an offshore loading facility 6 miles offshore. The cumulative analysis should also include impacts to climate change with regards to the value chain of SpaceX's operations (e.g. source of methane which is often fracked, condensing methane to liquid state, burning of fuels, etc.)

Considering the many changes since 2014, a 7 year period, and the scope of the Starship program, a new biological opinion is needed. The Starship is much larger, there will be more testing, more beach closures, and more traffic to SpaceX's facilities that are in an area where endangered wildlife is present. More closures of Boca Chica beach will result in increased inaccessibility to monitoring of endangered sea turtle nesting sites.

Since the Federal Aviation Administration already sent notice of preparing an EA, and if the FAA concludes a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) we request that the agency identify relevant areas of environmental concern, verify that EA supports the agency's determination that the potential impacts will be insignificant, and most importantly, identify mitigation measures that will be sufficient to reduce potential impacts below applicable significance thresholds and has ensured commitments to implement these measures. In other words, a Mitigated FONSI should be issued by the responsible FAA official. Additionally, I request the FAA enforce and/or hold SpaceX accountable to their required mitigation. Not all original 29 conditions from the EIS of 2014 were adhered to by SpaceX.

Alexis Bay
Edinburg, TX

JANUARY 21, 2021

Re: SpaceX proposal to conduct Starship/Super Heavy launch operations from the Boca Chica Launch Site in Cameron County, Texas.

I urge the FAA to conduct a new EIS for the SpaceX Starship/Super Heavy operations currently underway at SpaceX's Boca Chica site. From the 2014 FEIS, the objective of SpaceX's operations are entirely different, the launch vehicle is entirely different, and the size and scope of SpaceX is entirely different, which potentially in the future may include off-shore launches via superheavy-class spaceports, Superheavy re-landing on the launch stand, and a resort.

An EIS is in the interest of the public's concern to impacts that include accessibility of public lands, public safety, environment, wildlife, habitat, cumulative analysis of impacts, the unique characteristics of the geographic area (e.g., proximity to historic or cultural resources, parks, prime farmlands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers, ecologically critical areas, adverse impacts on endangered or threatened species or critical habitat; impacts that may be both beneficial and adverse. A significant impact may exist even if the Federal agency believes that on balance the impact will be beneficial; the degree to which the effects on the quality of the human environment are likely to be highly controversial; and whether the action is related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant impacts. Significance cannot be avoided by terming an action temporary or by breaking it down into component parts. An EIS most probably will more adequately address the differences and changes to SpaceX's operations. Ultimately, an EIS is needed to predict and mitigate anticipated consequences and prevent unintended consequences of SpaceX's proposals of the Starship program on the region of influence.

FAA should consider not just the "proposed project" and "no action" alternatives, but also other alternatives that include launches of Starship from an offshore platform or moving Starship launches to Cape Canaveral, for which the necessary infrastructure already exists and is situated further away from national wildlife refuge and/or state park land.

A new cumulative analysis needs to be conducted. A 3rd party launch failure analysis is needed due to the proximity of Port Isabel, Long Island Village and potentially three LNG export terminals (Annova LNG, Rio Grande LNG, Texas LNG) within 5 miles of the launch site. Public safety must be

the first and foremost consideration. Additionally, an analysis of the potential impacts to the proposed Jupiter LLC project, a crude upgrading, processing and export facility which includes an offshore loading facility 6 miles offshore. The cumulative analysis should also include impacts to climate change with regards to the value chain of SpaceX's operations (e.g. source of methane which is often fracked, condensing methane to liquid state, burning of fuels, etc.)

Considering the many changes since 2014, a 7 year period, and the scope of the Starship program, a new biological opinion is needed. The Starship is much larger, there will be more testing, more beach closures, and more traffic to SpaceX's facilities that are in an area where endangered wildlife is present. More closures of Boca Chica beach will result in increased inaccessibility to monitoring of endangered sea turtle nesting sites.

Since the Federal Aviation Administration already sent notice of preparing an EA, and if the FAA concludes a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) we request that the agency identify relevant areas of environmental concern, verify that EA supports the agency's determination that the potential impacts will be insignificant, and most importantly, identify mitigation measures that will be sufficient to reduce potential impacts below applicable significance thresholds and has ensured commitments to implement these measures. In other words, a Mitigated FONSI should be issued by the responsible FAA official. Additionally, I request the FAA enforce and/or hold SpaceX accountable to their required mitigation. Not all original 29 conditions from the EIS of 2014 were adhered to by SpaceX.

Andrea Gonzalez
Brownsville, TX

JANUARY 21, 2021

Re: SpaceX proposal to conduct Starship/Super Heavy launch operations from the Boca Chica Launch Site in Cameron County, Texas.

I urge the FAA to conduct a new EIS for the SpaceX Starship/Super Heavy operations currently underway at SpaceX's Boca Chica site. From the 2014 FEIS, the objective of SpaceX's operations are entirely different, the launch vehicle is entirely different, and the size and scope of SpaceX is entirely different, which potentially in the future may include off-shore launches via superheavy-class spaceports, Superheavy re-landing on the launch stand, and a resort.

An EIS is in the interest of the public's concern to impacts that include accessibility of public lands, public safety, environment, wildlife, habitat, cumulative analysis of impacts, the unique characteristics of the geographic area (e.g., proximity to historic or cultural resources, parks, prime farmlands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers, ecologically critical areas, adverse impacts on endangered or threatened species or critical habitat; impacts that may be both beneficial and adverse. A significant impact may exist even if the Federal agency believes that on balance the impact will be beneficial; the degree to which the effects on the quality of the human environment are likely to be highly controversial; and whether the action is related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant impacts. Significance cannot be avoided by terming an action temporary or by breaking it down into component parts. An EIS most probably will more adequately address the differences and changes to SpaceX's operations. Ultimately, an EIS is needed to predict and mitigate anticipated consequences and prevent unintended consequences of SpaceX's proposals of the Starship program on the region of influence.

FAA should consider not just the "proposed project" and "no action" alternatives, but also other alternatives that include launches of Starship from an offshore platform or moving Starship launches to Cape Canaveral, for which the necessary infrastructure already exists and is situated further away from national wildlife refuge and/or state park land.

A new cumulative analysis needs to be conducted. A 3rd party launch failure analysis is needed due to the proximity of Port Isabel, Long Island Village and potentially three LNG export terminals (Annova LNG, Rio Grande LNG, Texas LNG) within 5 miles of the launch site. Public safety must be

the first and foremost consideration. Additionally, an analysis of the potential impacts to the proposed Jupiter LLC project, a crude upgrading, processing and export facility which includes an offshore loading facility 6 miles offshore. The cumulative analysis should also include impacts to climate change with regards to the value chain of SpaceX's operations (e.g. source of methane which is often fracked, condensing methane to liquid state, burning of fuels, etc.)

Considering the many changes since 2014, a 7 year period, and the scope of the Starship program, a new biological opinion is needed. The Starship is much larger, there will be more testing, more beach closures, and more traffic to SpaceX's facilities that are in an area where endangered wildlife is present. More closures of Boca Chica beach will result in increased inaccessibility to monitoring of endangered sea turtle nesting sites.

Since the Federal Aviation Administration already sent notice of preparing an EA, and if the FAA concludes a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) we request that the agency identify relevant areas of environmental concern, verify that EA supports the agency's determination that the potential impacts will be insignificant, and most importantly, identify mitigation measures that will be sufficient to reduce potential impacts below applicable significance thresholds and has ensured commitments to implement these measures. In other words, a Mitigated FONSI should be issued by the responsible FAA official. Additionally, I request the FAA enforce and/or hold SpaceX accountable to their required mitigation. Not all original 29 conditions from the EIS of 2014 were adhered to by SpaceX.

Angelia Reeves
Port Isabel, TX

JANUARY 21, 2021

Re: SpaceX proposal to conduct Starship/Super Heavy launch operations from the Boca Chica Launch Site in Cameron County, Texas.

I urge the FAA to conduct a new EIS for the SpaceX Starship/Super Heavy operations currently underway at SpaceX's Boca Chica site. From the 2014 FEIS, the objective of SpaceX's operations are entirely different, the launch vehicle is entirely different, and the size and scope of SpaceX is entirely different, which potentially in the future may include off-shore launches via superheavy-class spaceports, Superheavy re-landing on the launch stand, and a resort.

An EIS is in the interest of the public's concern to impacts that include accessibility of public lands, public safety, environment, wildlife, habitat, cumulative analysis of impacts, the unique characteristics of the geographic area (e.g., proximity to historic or cultural resources, parks, prime farmlands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers, ecologically critical areas, adverse impacts on endangered or threatened species or critical habitat; impacts that may be both beneficial and adverse. A significant impact may exist even if the Federal agency believes that on balance the impact will be beneficial; the degree to which the effects on the quality of the human environment are likely to be highly controversial; and whether the action is related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant impacts. Significance cannot be avoided by terming an action temporary or by breaking it down into component parts. An EIS most probably will more adequately address the differences and changes to SpaceX's operations. Ultimately, an EIS is needed to predict and mitigate anticipated consequences and prevent unintended consequences of SpaceX's proposals of the Starship program on the region of influence.

FAA should consider not just the "proposed project" and "no action" alternatives, but also other alternatives that include launches of Starship from an offshore platform or moving Starship launches to Cape Canaveral, for which the necessary infrastructure already exists and is situated further away from national wildlife refuge and/or state park land.

A new cumulative analysis needs to be conducted. A 3rd party launch failure analysis is needed due to the proximity of Port Isabel, Long Island Village and potentially three LNG export terminals (Annova LNG, Rio Grande LNG, Texas LNG) within 5 miles of the launch site. Public safety must be

the first and foremost consideration. Additionally, an analysis of the potential impacts to the proposed Jupiter LLC project, a crude upgrading, processing and export facility which includes an offshore loading facility 6 miles offshore. The cumulative analysis should also include impacts to climate change with regards to the value chain of SpaceX's operations (e.g. source of methane which is often fracked, condensing methane to liquid state, burning of fuels, etc.)

Considering the many changes since 2014, a 7 year period, and the scope of the Starship program, a new biological opinion is needed. The Starship is much larger, there will be more testing, more beach closures, and more traffic to SpaceX's facilities that are in an area where endangered wildlife is present. More closures of Boca Chica beach will result in increased inaccessibility to monitoring of endangered sea turtle nesting sites.

Since the Federal Aviation Administration already sent notice of preparing an EA, and if the FAA concludes a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) we request that the agency identify relevant areas of environmental concern, verify that EA supports the agency's determination that the potential impacts will be insignificant, and most importantly, identify mitigation measures that will be sufficient to reduce potential impacts below applicable significance thresholds and has ensured commitments to implement these measures. In other words, a Mitigated FONSI should be issued by the responsible FAA official. Additionally, I request the FAA enforce and/or hold SpaceX accountable to their required mitigation. Not all original 29 conditions from the EIS of 2014 were adhered to by SpaceX.

Betty Perez
Penitas, TX

JANUARY 21, 2021

Re: SpaceX proposal to conduct Starship/Super Heavy launch operations from the Boca Chica Launch Site in Cameron County, Texas.

I urge the FAA to conduct a new EIS for the SpaceX Starship/Super Heavy operations currently underway at SpaceX's Boca Chica site. From the 2014 FEIS, the objective of SpaceX's operations are entirely different, the launch vehicle is entirely different, and the size and scope of SpaceX is entirely different, which potentially in the future may include off-shore launches via superheavy-class spaceports, Superheavy re-landing on the launch stand, and a resort.

An EIS is in the interest of the public's concern to impacts that include accessibility of public lands, public safety, environment, wildlife, habitat, cumulative analysis of impacts, the unique characteristics of the geographic area (e.g., proximity to historic or cultural resources, parks, prime farmlands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers, ecologically critical areas, adverse impacts on endangered or threatened species or critical habitat; impacts that may be both beneficial and adverse. A significant impact may exist even if the Federal agency believes that on balance the impact will be beneficial; the degree to which the effects on the quality of the human environment are likely to be highly controversial; and whether the action is related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant impacts. Significance cannot be avoided by terming an action temporary or by breaking it down into component parts. An EIS most probably will more adequately address the differences and changes to SpaceX's operations. Ultimately, an EIS is needed to predict and mitigate anticipated consequences and prevent unintended consequences of SpaceX's proposals of the Starship program on the region of influence.

FAA should consider not just the "proposed project" and "no action" alternatives, but also other alternatives that include launches of Starship from an offshore platform or moving Starship launches to Cape Canaveral, for which the necessary infrastructure already exists and is situated further away from national wildlife refuge and/or state park land.

A new cumulative analysis needs to be conducted. A 3rd party launch failure analysis is needed due to the proximity of Port Isabel, Long Island Village and potentially three LNG export terminals (Annova LNG, Rio Grande LNG, Texas LNG) within 5 miles of the launch site. Public safety must be

the first and foremost consideration. Additionally, an analysis of the potential impacts to the proposed Jupiter LLC project, a crude upgrading, processing and export facility which includes an offshore loading facility 6 miles offshore. The cumulative analysis should also include impacts to climate change with regards to the value chain of SpaceX's operations (e.g. source of methane which is often fracked, condensing methane to liquid state, burning of fuels, etc.)

Considering the many changes since 2014, a 7 year period, and the scope of the Starship program, a new biological opinion is needed. The Starship is much larger, there will be more testing, more beach closures, and more traffic to SpaceX's facilities that are in an area where endangered wildlife is present. More closures of Boca Chica beach will result in increased inaccessibility to monitoring of endangered sea turtle nesting sites.

Since the Federal Aviation Administration already sent notice of preparing an EA, and if the FAA concludes a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) we request that the agency identify relevant areas of environmental concern, verify that EA supports the agency's determination that the potential impacts will be insignificant, and most importantly, identify mitigation measures that will be sufficient to reduce potential impacts below applicable significance thresholds and has ensured commitments to implement these measures. In other words, a Mitigated FONSI should be issued by the responsible FAA official. Additionally, I request the FAA enforce and/or hold SpaceX accountable to their required mitigation. Not all original 29 conditions from the EIS of 2014 were adhered to by SpaceX.

Celeste Morris
Converse, TX

JANUARY 21, 2021

Re: SpaceX proposal to conduct Starship/Super Heavy launch operations from the Boca Chica Launch Site in Cameron County, Texas.

I urge the FAA to conduct a new EIS for the SpaceX Starship/Super Heavy operations currently underway at SpaceX's Boca Chica site. From the 2014 FEIS, the objective of SpaceX's operations are entirely different, the launch vehicle is entirely different, and the size and scope of SpaceX is entirely different, which potentially in the future may include off-shore launches via superheavy-class spaceports, Superheavy re-landing on the launch stand, and a resort.

An EIS is in the interest of the public's concern to impacts that include accessibility of public lands, public safety, environment, wildlife, habitat, cumulative analysis of impacts, the unique characteristics of the geographic area (e.g., proximity to historic or cultural resources, parks, prime farmlands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers, ecologically critical areas, adverse impacts on endangered or threatened species or critical habitat; impacts that may be both beneficial and adverse. A significant impact may exist even if the Federal agency believes that on balance the impact will be beneficial; the degree to which the effects on the quality of the human environment are likely to be highly controversial; and whether the action is related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant impacts. Significance cannot be avoided by terming an action temporary or by breaking it down into component parts. An EIS most probably will more adequately address the differences and changes to SpaceX's operations. Ultimately, an EIS is needed to predict and mitigate anticipated consequences and prevent unintended consequences of SpaceX's proposals of the Starship program on the region of influence.

FAA should consider not just the "proposed project" and "no action" alternatives, but also other alternatives that include launches of Starship from an offshore platform or moving Starship launches to Cape Canaveral, for which the necessary infrastructure already exists and is situated further away from national wildlife refuge and/or state park land.

A new cumulative analysis needs to be conducted. A 3rd party launch failure analysis is needed due to the proximity of Port Isabel, Long Island Village and potentially three LNG export terminals (Annova LNG, Rio Grande LNG, Texas LNG) within 5 miles of the launch site. Public safety must be

the first and foremost consideration. Additionally, an analysis of the potential impacts to the proposed Jupiter LLC project, a crude upgrading, processing and export facility which includes an offshore loading facility 6 miles offshore. The cumulative analysis should also include impacts to climate change with regards to the value chain of SpaceX's operations (e.g. source of methane which is often fracked, condensing methane to liquid state, burning of fuels, etc.)

Considering the many changes since 2014, a 7 year period, and the scope of the Starship program, a new biological opinion is needed. The Starship is much larger, there will be more testing, more beach closures, and more traffic to SpaceX's facilities that are in an area where endangered wildlife is present. More closures of Boca Chica beach will result in increased inaccessibility to monitoring of endangered sea turtle nesting sites.

Since the Federal Aviation Administration already sent notice of preparing an EA, and if the FAA concludes a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) we request that the agency identify relevant areas of environmental concern, verify that EA supports the agency's determination that the potential impacts will be insignificant, and most importantly, identify mitigation measures that will be sufficient to reduce potential impacts below applicable significance thresholds and has ensured commitments to implement these measures. In other words, a Mitigated FONSI should be issued by the responsible FAA official. Additionally, I request the FAA enforce and/or hold SpaceX accountable to their required mitigation. Not all original 29 conditions from the EIS of 2014 were adhered to by SpaceX.

Cindy Spoon
San Antonio, TX

JANUARY 21, 2021

Re: SpaceX proposal to conduct Starship/Super Heavy launch operations from the Boca Chica Launch Site in Cameron County, Texas.

I urge the FAA to conduct a new EIS for the SpaceX Starship/Super Heavy operations currently underway at SpaceX's Boca Chica site. From the 2014 FEIS, the objective of SpaceX's operations are entirely different, the launch vehicle is entirely different, and the size and scope of SpaceX is entirely different, which potentially in the future may include off-shore launches via superheavy-class spaceports, Superheavy re-landing on the launch stand, and a resort.

An EIS is in the interest of the public's concern to impacts that include accessibility of public lands, public safety, environment, wildlife, habitat, cumulative analysis of impacts, the unique characteristics of the geographic area (e.g., proximity to historic or cultural resources, parks, prime farmlands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers, ecologically critical areas, adverse impacts on endangered or threatened species or critical habitat; impacts that may be both beneficial and adverse. A significant impact may exist even if the Federal agency believes that on balance the impact will be beneficial; the degree to which the effects on the quality of the human environment are likely to be highly controversial; and whether the action is related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant impacts. Significance cannot be avoided by terming an action temporary or by breaking it down into component parts. An EIS most probably will more adequately address the differences and changes to SpaceX's operations. Ultimately, an EIS is needed to predict and mitigate anticipated consequences and prevent unintended consequences of SpaceX's proposals of the Starship program on the region of influence.

FAA should consider not just the "proposed project" and "no action" alternatives, but also other alternatives that include launches of Starship from an offshore platform or moving Starship launches to Cape Canaveral, for which the necessary infrastructure already exists and is situated further away from national wildlife refuge and/or state park land.

A new cumulative analysis needs to be conducted. A 3rd party launch failure analysis is needed due to the proximity of Port Isabel, Long Island Village and potentially three LNG export terminals (Annova LNG, Rio Grande LNG, Texas LNG) within 5 miles of the launch site. Public safety must be

the first and foremost consideration. Additionally, an analysis of the potential impacts to the proposed Jupiter LLC project, a crude upgrading, processing and export facility which includes an offshore loading facility 6 miles offshore. The cumulative analysis should also include impacts to climate change with regards to the value chain of SpaceX's operations (e.g. source of methane which is often fracked, condensing methane to liquid state, burning of fuels, etc.)

Considering the many changes since 2014, a 7 year period, and the scope of the Starship program, a new biological opinion is needed. The Starship is much larger, there will be more testing, more beach closures, and more traffic to SpaceX's facilities that are in an area where endangered wildlife is present. More closures of Boca Chica beach will result in increased inaccessibility to monitoring of endangered sea turtle nesting sites.

Since the Federal Aviation Administration already sent notice of preparing an EA, and if the FAA concludes a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) we request that the agency identify relevant areas of environmental concern, verify that EA supports the agency's determination that the potential impacts will be insignificant, and most importantly, identify mitigation measures that will be sufficient to reduce potential impacts below applicable significance thresholds and has ensured commitments to implement these measures. In other words, a Mitigated FONSI should be issued by the responsible FAA official. Additionally, I request the FAA enforce and/or hold SpaceX accountable to their required mitigation. Not all original 29 conditions from the EIS of 2014 were adhered to by SpaceX.

Elizabeth Pearl
South Padre Island, TX

JANUARY 21, 2021

Re: SpaceX proposal to conduct Starship/Super Heavy launch operations from the Boca Chica Launch Site in Cameron County, Texas.

I urge the FAA to conduct a new EIS for the SpaceX Starship/Super Heavy operations currently underway at SpaceX's Boca Chica site. From the 2014 FEIS, the objective of SpaceX's operations are entirely different, the launch vehicle is entirely different, and the size and scope of SpaceX is entirely different, which potentially in the future may include off-shore launches via superheavy-class spaceports, Superheavy re-landing on the launch stand, and a resort.

An EIS is in the interest of the public's concern to impacts that include accessibility of public lands, public safety, environment, wildlife, habitat, cumulative analysis of impacts, the unique characteristics of the geographic area (e.g., proximity to historic or cultural resources, parks, prime farmlands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers, ecologically critical areas, adverse impacts on endangered or threatened species or critical habitat; impacts that may be both beneficial and adverse. A significant impact may exist even if the Federal agency believes that on balance the impact will be beneficial; the degree to which the effects on the quality of the human environment are likely to be highly controversial; and whether the action is related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant impacts. Significance cannot be avoided by terming an action temporary or by breaking it down into component parts. An EIS most probably will more adequately address the differences and changes to SpaceX's operations. Ultimately, an EIS is needed to predict and mitigate anticipated consequences and prevent unintended consequences of SpaceX's proposals of the Starship program on the region of influence.

FAA should consider not just the "proposed project" and "no action" alternatives, but also other alternatives that include launches of Starship from an offshore platform or moving Starship launches to Cape Canaveral, for which the necessary infrastructure already exists and is situated further away from national wildlife refuge and/or state park land.

A new cumulative analysis needs to be conducted. A 3rd party launch failure analysis is needed due to the proximity of Port Isabel, Long Island Village and potentially three LNG export terminals (Annova LNG, Rio Grande LNG, Texas LNG) within 5 miles of the launch site. Public safety must be

the first and foremost consideration. Additionally, an analysis of the potential impacts to the proposed Jupiter LLC project, a crude upgrading, processing and export facility which includes an offshore loading facility 6 miles offshore. The cumulative analysis should also include impacts to climate change with regards to the value chain of SpaceX's operations (e.g. source of methane which is often fracked, condensing methane to liquid state, burning of fuels, etc.)

Considering the many changes since 2014, a 7 year period, and the scope of the Starship program, a new biological opinion is needed. The Starship is much larger, there will be more testing, more beach closures, and more traffic to SpaceX's facilities that are in an area where endangered wildlife is present. More closures of Boca Chica beach will result in increased inaccessibility to monitoring of endangered sea turtle nesting sites.

Since the Federal Aviation Administration already sent notice of preparing an EA, and if the FAA concludes a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) we request that the agency identify relevant areas of environmental concern, verify that EA supports the agency's determination that the potential impacts will be insignificant, and most importantly, identify mitigation measures that will be sufficient to reduce potential impacts below applicable significance thresholds and has ensured commitments to implement these measures. In other words, a Mitigated FONSI should be issued by the responsible FAA official. Additionally, I request the FAA enforce and/or hold SpaceX accountable to their required mitigation. Not all original 29 conditions from the EIS of 2014 were adhered to by SpaceX.

Elizabeth Watts
Boynton Beach, FL

JANUARY 21, 2021

Re: SpaceX proposal to conduct Starship/Super Heavy launch operations from the Boca Chica Launch Site in Cameron County, Texas.

I urge the FAA to conduct a new EIS for the SpaceX Starship/Super Heavy operations currently underway at SpaceX's Boca Chica site. From the 2014 FEIS, the objective of SpaceX's operations are entirely different, the launch vehicle is entirely different, and the size and scope of SpaceX is entirely different, which potentially in the future may include off-shore launches via superheavy-class spaceports, Superheavy re-landing on the launch stand, and a resort.

An EIS is in the interest of the public's concern to impacts that include accessibility of public lands, public safety, environment, wildlife, habitat, cumulative analysis of impacts, the unique characteristics of the geographic area (e.g., proximity to historic or cultural resources, parks, prime farmlands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers, ecologically critical areas, adverse impacts on endangered or threatened species or critical habitat; impacts that may be both beneficial and adverse. A significant impact may exist even if the Federal agency believes that on balance the impact will be beneficial; the degree to which the effects on the quality of the human environment are likely to be highly controversial; and whether the action is related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant impacts. Significance cannot be avoided by terming an action temporary or by breaking it down into component parts. An EIS most probably will more adequately address the differences and changes to SpaceX's operations. Ultimately, an EIS is needed to predict and mitigate anticipated consequences and prevent unintended consequences of SpaceX's proposals of the Starship program on the region of influence.

FAA should consider not just the "proposed project" and "no action" alternatives, but also other alternatives that include launches of Starship from an offshore platform or moving Starship launches to Cape Canaveral, for which the necessary infrastructure already exists and is situated further away from national wildlife refuge and/or state park land.

A new cumulative analysis needs to be conducted. A 3rd party launch failure analysis is needed due to the proximity of Port Isabel, Long Island Village and potentially three LNG export terminals (Annova LNG, Rio Grande LNG, Texas LNG) within 5 miles of the launch site. Public safety must be

the first and foremost consideration. Additionally, an analysis of the potential impacts to the proposed Jupiter LLC project, a crude upgrading, processing and export facility which includes an offshore loading facility 6 miles offshore. The cumulative analysis should also include impacts to climate change with regards to the value chain of SpaceX's operations (e.g. source of methane which is often fracked, condensing methane to liquid state, burning of fuels, etc.)

Considering the many changes since 2014, a 7 year period, and the scope of the Starship program, a new biological opinion is needed. The Starship is much larger, there will be more testing, more beach closures, and more traffic to SpaceX's facilities that are in an area where endangered wildlife is present. More closures of Boca Chica beach will result in increased inaccessibility to monitoring of endangered sea turtle nesting sites.

Since the Federal Aviation Administration already sent notice of preparing an EA, and if the FAA concludes a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) we request that the agency identify relevant areas of environmental concern, verify that EA supports the agency's determination that the potential impacts will be insignificant, and most importantly, identify mitigation measures that will be sufficient to reduce potential impacts below applicable significance thresholds and has ensured commitments to implement these measures. In other words, a Mitigated FONSI should be issued by the responsible FAA official. Additionally, I request the FAA enforce and/or hold SpaceX accountable to their required mitigation. Not all original 29 conditions from the EIS of 2014 were adhered to by SpaceX.

Felicity Hohenshelt
Jacksonville, FL

JANUARY 21, 2021

Re: SpaceX proposal to conduct Starship/Super Heavy launch operations from the Boca Chica Launch Site in Cameron County, Texas.

I urge the FAA to conduct a new EIS for the SpaceX Starship/Super Heavy operations currently underway at SpaceX's Boca Chica site. From the 2014 FEIS, the objective of SpaceX's operations are entirely different, the launch vehicle is entirely different, and the size and scope of SpaceX is entirely different, which potentially in the future may include off-shore launches via superheavy-class spaceports, Superheavy re-landing on the launch stand, and a resort.

An EIS is in the interest of the public's concern to impacts that include accessibility of public lands, public safety, environment, wildlife, habitat, cumulative analysis of impacts, the unique characteristics of the geographic area (e.g., proximity to historic or cultural resources, parks, prime farmlands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers, ecologically critical areas, adverse impacts on endangered or threatened species or critical habitat; impacts that may be both beneficial and adverse. A significant impact may exist even if the Federal agency believes that on balance the impact will be beneficial; the degree to which the effects on the quality of the human environment are likely to be highly controversial; and whether the action is related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant impacts. Significance cannot be avoided by terming an action temporary or by breaking it down into component parts. An EIS most probably will more adequately address the differences and changes to SpaceX's operations. Ultimately, an EIS is needed to predict and mitigate anticipated consequences and prevent unintended consequences of SpaceX's proposals of the Starship program on the region of influence.

FAA should consider not just the "proposed project" and "no action" alternatives, but also other alternatives that include launches of Starship from an offshore platform or moving Starship launches to Cape Canaveral, for which the necessary infrastructure already exists and is situated further away from national wildlife refuge and/or state park land.

A new cumulative analysis needs to be conducted. A 3rd party launch failure analysis is needed due to the proximity of Port Isabel, Long Island Village and potentially three LNG export terminals (Annova LNG, Rio Grande LNG, Texas LNG) within 5 miles of the launch site. Public safety must be

the first and foremost consideration. Additionally, an analysis of the potential impacts to the proposed Jupiter LLC project, a crude upgrading, processing and export facility which includes an offshore loading facility 6 miles offshore. The cumulative analysis should also include impacts to climate change with regards to the value chain of SpaceX's operations (e.g. source of methane which is often fracked, condensing methane to liquid state, burning of fuels, etc.)

Considering the many changes since 2014, a 7 year period, and the scope of the Starship program, a new biological opinion is needed. The Starship is much larger, there will be more testing, more beach closures, and more traffic to SpaceX's facilities that are in an area where endangered wildlife is present. More closures of Boca Chica beach will result in increased inaccessibility to monitoring of endangered sea turtle nesting sites.

Since the Federal Aviation Administration already sent notice of preparing an EA, and if the FAA concludes a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) we request that the agency identify relevant areas of environmental concern, verify that EA supports the agency's determination that the potential impacts will be insignificant, and most importantly, identify mitigation measures that will be sufficient to reduce potential impacts below applicable significance thresholds and has ensured commitments to implement these measures. In other words, a Mitigated FONSI should be issued by the responsible FAA official. Additionally, I request the FAA enforce and/or hold SpaceX accountable to their required mitigation. Not all original 29 conditions from the EIS of 2014 were adhered to by SpaceX.

Gregory Jordan
Los Fresnos, TX

JANUARY 21, 2021

Re: SpaceX proposal to conduct Starship/Super Heavy launch operations from the Boca Chica Launch Site in Cameron County, Texas.

I urge the FAA to conduct a new EIS for the SpaceX Starship/Super Heavy operations currently underway at SpaceX's Boca Chica site. From the 2014 FEIS, the objective of SpaceX's operations are entirely different, the launch vehicle is entirely different, and the size and scope of SpaceX is entirely different, which potentially in the future may include off-shore launches via superheavy-class spaceports, Superheavy re-landing on the launch stand, and a resort.

An EIS is in the interest of the public's concern to impacts that include accessibility of public lands, public safety, environment, wildlife, habitat, cumulative analysis of impacts, the unique characteristics of the geographic area (e.g., proximity to historic or cultural resources, parks, prime farmlands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers, ecologically critical areas, adverse impacts on endangered or threatened species or critical habitat; impacts that may be both beneficial and adverse. A significant impact may exist even if the Federal agency believes that on balance the impact will be beneficial; the degree to which the effects on the quality of the human environment are likely to be highly controversial; and whether the action is related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant impacts. Significance cannot be avoided by terming an action temporary or by breaking it down into component parts. An EIS most probably will more adequately address the differences and changes to SpaceX's operations. Ultimately, an EIS is needed to predict and mitigate anticipated consequences and prevent unintended consequences of SpaceX's proposals of the Starship program on the region of influence.

FAA should consider not just the "proposed project" and "no action" alternatives, but also other alternatives that include launches of Starship from an offshore platform or moving Starship launches to Cape Canaveral, for which the necessary infrastructure already exists and is situated further away from national wildlife refuge and/or state park land.

A new cumulative analysis needs to be conducted. A 3rd party launch failure analysis is needed due to the proximity of Port Isabel, Long Island Village and potentially three LNG export terminals (Annova LNG, Rio Grande LNG, Texas LNG) within 5 miles of the launch site. Public safety must be

the first and foremost consideration. Additionally, an analysis of the potential impacts to the proposed Jupiter LLC project, a crude upgrading, processing and export facility which includes an offshore loading facility 6 miles offshore. The cumulative analysis should also include impacts to climate change with regards to the value chain of SpaceX's operations (e.g. source of methane which is often fracked, condensing methane to liquid state, burning of fuels, etc.)

Considering the many changes since 2014, a 7 year period, and the scope of the Starship program, a new biological opinion is needed. The Starship is much larger, there will be more testing, more beach closures, and more traffic to SpaceX's facilities that are in an area where endangered wildlife is present. More closures of Boca Chica beach will result in increased inaccessibility to monitoring of endangered sea turtle nesting sites.

Since the Federal Aviation Administration already sent notice of preparing an EA, and if the FAA concludes a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) we request that the agency identify relevant areas of environmental concern, verify that EA supports the agency's determination that the potential impacts will be insignificant, and most importantly, identify mitigation measures that will be sufficient to reduce potential impacts below applicable significance thresholds and has ensured commitments to implement these measures. In other words, a Mitigated FONSI should be issued by the responsible FAA official. Additionally, I request the FAA enforce and/or hold SpaceX accountable to their required mitigation. Not all original 29 conditions from the EIS of 2014 were adhered to by SpaceX.

Hayley Austin
Fort Worth, TX

JANUARY 21, 2021

Re: SpaceX proposal to conduct Starship/Super Heavy launch operations from the Boca Chica Launch Site in Cameron County, Texas.

I urge the FAA to conduct a new EIS for the SpaceX Starship/Super Heavy operations currently underway at SpaceX's Boca Chica site. From the 2014 FEIS, the objective of SpaceX's operations are entirely different, the launch vehicle is entirely different, and the size and scope of SpaceX is entirely different, which potentially in the future may include off-shore launches via superheavy-class spaceports, Superheavy re-landing on the launch stand, and a resort.

An EIS is in the interest of the public's concern to impacts that include accessibility of public lands, public safety, environment, wildlife, habitat, cumulative analysis of impacts, the unique characteristics of the geographic area (e.g., proximity to historic or cultural resources, parks, prime farmlands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers, ecologically critical areas, adverse impacts on endangered or threatened species or critical habitat; impacts that may be both beneficial and adverse. A significant impact may exist even if the Federal agency believes that on balance the impact will be beneficial; the degree to which the effects on the quality of the human environment are likely to be highly controversial; and whether the action is related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant impacts. Significance cannot be avoided by terming an action temporary or by breaking it down into component parts. An EIS most probably will more adequately address the differences and changes to SpaceX's operations. Ultimately, an EIS is needed to predict and mitigate anticipated consequences and prevent unintended consequences of SpaceX's proposals of the Starship program on the region of influence.

FAA should consider not just the "proposed project" and "no action" alternatives, but also other alternatives that include launches of Starship from an offshore platform or moving Starship launches to Cape Canaveral, for which the necessary infrastructure already exists and is situated further away from national wildlife refuge and/or state park land.

A new cumulative analysis needs to be conducted. A 3rd party launch failure analysis is needed due to the proximity of Port Isabel, Long Island Village and potentially three LNG export terminals (Annova LNG, Rio Grande LNG, Texas LNG) within 5 miles of the launch site. Public safety must be

the first and foremost consideration. Additionally, an analysis of the potential impacts to the proposed Jupiter LLC project, a crude upgrading, processing and export facility which includes an offshore loading facility 6 miles offshore. The cumulative analysis should also include impacts to climate change with regards to the value chain of SpaceX's operations (e.g. source of methane which is often fracked, condensing methane to liquid state, burning of fuels, etc.)

Considering the many changes since 2014, a 7 year period, and the scope of the Starship program, a new biological opinion is needed. The Starship is much larger, there will be more testing, more beach closures, and more traffic to SpaceX's facilities that are in an area where endangered wildlife is present. More closures of Boca Chica beach will result in increased inaccessibility to monitoring of endangered sea turtle nesting sites.

Since the Federal Aviation Administration already sent notice of preparing an EA, and if the FAA concludes a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) we request that the agency identify relevant areas of environmental concern, verify that EA supports the agency's determination that the potential impacts will be insignificant, and most importantly, identify mitigation measures that will be sufficient to reduce potential impacts below applicable significance thresholds and has ensured commitments to implement these measures. In other words, a Mitigated FONSI should be issued by the responsible FAA official. Additionally, I request the FAA enforce and/or hold SpaceX accountable to their required mitigation. Not all original 29 conditions from the EIS of 2014 were adhered to by SpaceX.

Javier Guerra
Austin, TX

JANUARY 21, 2021

Re: SpaceX proposal to conduct Starship/Super Heavy launch operations from the Boca Chica Launch Site in Cameron County, Texas.

I urge the FAA to conduct a new EIS for the SpaceX Starship/Super Heavy operations currently underway at SpaceX's Boca Chica site. From the 2014 FEIS, the objective of SpaceX's operations are entirely different, the launch vehicle is entirely different, and the size and scope of SpaceX is entirely different, which potentially in the future may include off-shore launches via superheavy-class spaceports, Superheavy re-landing on the launch stand, and a resort.

An EIS is in the interest of the public's concern to impacts that include accessibility of public lands, public safety, environment, wildlife, habitat, cumulative analysis of impacts, the unique characteristics of the geographic area (e.g., proximity to historic or cultural resources, parks, prime farmlands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers, ecologically critical areas, adverse impacts on endangered or threatened species or critical habitat; impacts that may be both beneficial and adverse. A significant impact may exist even if the Federal agency believes that on balance the impact will be beneficial; the degree to which the effects on the quality of the human environment are likely to be highly controversial; and whether the action is related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant impacts. Significance cannot be avoided by terming an action temporary or by breaking it down into component parts. An EIS most probably will more adequately address the differences and changes to SpaceX's operations. Ultimately, an EIS is needed to predict and mitigate anticipated consequences and prevent unintended consequences of SpaceX's proposals of the Starship program on the region of influence.

FAA should consider not just the "proposed project" and "no action" alternatives, but also other alternatives that include launches of Starship from an offshore platform or moving Starship launches to Cape Canaveral, for which the necessary infrastructure already exists and is situated further away from national wildlife refuge and/or state park land.

A new cumulative analysis needs to be conducted. A 3rd party launch failure analysis is needed due to the proximity of Port Isabel, Long Island Village and potentially three LNG export terminals (Annova LNG, Rio Grande LNG, Texas LNG) within 5 miles of the launch site. Public safety must be

the first and foremost consideration. Additionally, an analysis of the potential impacts to the proposed Jupiter LLC project, a crude upgrading, processing and export facility which includes an offshore loading facility 6 miles offshore. The cumulative analysis should also include impacts to climate change with regards to the value chain of SpaceX's operations (e.g. source of methane which is often fracked, condensing methane to liquid state, burning of fuels, etc.)

Considering the many changes since 2014, a 7 year period, and the scope of the Starship program, a new biological opinion is needed. The Starship is much larger, there will be more testing, more beach closures, and more traffic to SpaceX's facilities that are in an area where endangered wildlife is present. More closures of Boca Chica beach will result in increased inaccessibility to monitoring of endangered sea turtle nesting sites.

Since the Federal Aviation Administration already sent notice of preparing an EA, and if the FAA concludes a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) we request that the agency identify relevant areas of environmental concern, verify that EA supports the agency's determination that the potential impacts will be insignificant, and most importantly, identify mitigation measures that will be sufficient to reduce potential impacts below applicable significance thresholds and has ensured commitments to implement these measures. In other words, a Mitigated FONSI should be issued by the responsible FAA official. Additionally, I request the FAA enforce and/or hold SpaceX accountable to their required mitigation. Not all original 29 conditions from the EIS of 2014 were adhered to by SpaceX.

Jennifer Johnson
San Antonio, TX

JANUARY 21, 2021

Re: SpaceX proposal to conduct Starship/Super Heavy launch operations from the Boca Chica Launch Site in Cameron County, Texas.

I urge the FAA to conduct a new EIS for the SpaceX Starship/Super Heavy operations currently underway at SpaceX's Boca Chica site. From the 2014 FEIS, the objective of SpaceX's operations are entirely different, the launch vehicle is entirely different, and the size and scope of SpaceX is entirely different, which potentially in the future may include off-shore launches via superheavy-class spaceports, Superheavy re-landing on the launch stand, and a resort.

An EIS is in the interest of the public's concern to impacts that include accessibility of public lands, public safety, environment, wildlife, habitat, cumulative analysis of impacts, the unique characteristics of the geographic area (e.g., proximity to historic or cultural resources, parks, prime farmlands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers, ecologically critical areas, adverse impacts on endangered or threatened species or critical habitat; impacts that may be both beneficial and adverse. A significant impact may exist even if the Federal agency believes that on balance the impact will be beneficial; the degree to which the effects on the quality of the human environment are likely to be highly controversial; and whether the action is related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant impacts. Significance cannot be avoided by terming an action temporary or by breaking it down into component parts. An EIS most probably will more adequately address the differences and changes to SpaceX's operations. Ultimately, an EIS is needed to predict and mitigate anticipated consequences and prevent unintended consequences of SpaceX's proposals of the Starship program on the region of influence.

FAA should consider not just the "proposed project" and "no action" alternatives, but also other alternatives that include launches of Starship from an offshore platform or moving Starship launches to Cape Canaveral, for which the necessary infrastructure already exists and is situated further away from national wildlife refuge and/or state park land.

A new cumulative analysis needs to be conducted. A 3rd party launch failure analysis is needed due to the proximity of Port Isabel, Long Island Village and potentially three LNG export terminals (Annova LNG, Rio Grande LNG, Texas LNG) within 5 miles of the launch site. Public safety must be

the first and foremost consideration. Additionally, an analysis of the potential impacts to the proposed Jupiter LLC project, a crude upgrading, processing and export facility which includes an offshore loading facility 6 miles offshore. The cumulative analysis should also include impacts to climate change with regards to the value chain of SpaceX's operations (e.g. source of methane which is often fracked, condensing methane to liquid state, burning of fuels, etc.)

Considering the many changes since 2014, a 7 year period, and the scope of the Starship program, a new biological opinion is needed. The Starship is much larger, there will be more testing, more beach closures, and more traffic to SpaceX's facilities that are in an area where endangered wildlife is present. More closures of Boca Chica beach will result in increased inaccessibility to monitoring of endangered sea turtle nesting sites.

Since the Federal Aviation Administration already sent notice of preparing an EA, and if the FAA concludes a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) we request that the agency identify relevant areas of environmental concern, verify that EA supports the agency's determination that the potential impacts will be insignificant, and most importantly, identify mitigation measures that will be sufficient to reduce potential impacts below applicable significance thresholds and has ensured commitments to implement these measures. In other words, a Mitigated FONSI should be issued by the responsible FAA official. Additionally, I request the FAA enforce and/or hold SpaceX accountable to their required mitigation. Not all original 29 conditions from the EIS of 2014 were adhered to by SpaceX.

Joel Brotzman-Gonzales
Harlingen, TX

JANUARY 21, 2021

Re: SpaceX proposal to conduct Starship/Super Heavy launch operations from the Boca Chica Launch Site in Cameron County, Texas.

I urge the FAA to conduct a new EIS for the SpaceX Starship/Super Heavy operations currently underway at SpaceX's Boca Chica site. From the 2014 FEIS, the objective of SpaceX's operations are entirely different, the launch vehicle is entirely different, and the size and scope of SpaceX is entirely different, which potentially in the future may include off-shore launches via superheavy-class spaceports, Superheavy re-landing on the launch stand, and a resort.

An EIS is in the interest of the public's concern to impacts that include accessibility of public lands, public safety, environment, wildlife, habitat, cumulative analysis of impacts, the unique characteristics of the geographic area (e.g., proximity to historic or cultural resources, parks, prime farmlands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers, ecologically critical areas, adverse impacts on endangered or threatened species or critical habitat; impacts that may be both beneficial and adverse. A significant impact may exist even if the Federal agency believes that on balance the impact will be beneficial; the degree to which the effects on the quality of the human environment are likely to be highly controversial; and whether the action is related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant impacts. Significance cannot be avoided by terming an action temporary or by breaking it down into component parts. An EIS most probably will more adequately address the differences and changes to SpaceX's operations. Ultimately, an EIS is needed to predict and mitigate anticipated consequences and prevent unintended consequences of SpaceX's proposals of the Starship program on the region of influence.

FAA should consider not just the "proposed project" and "no action" alternatives, but also other alternatives that include launches of Starship from an offshore platform or moving Starship launches to Cape Canaveral, for which the necessary infrastructure already exists and is situated further away from national wildlife refuge and/or state park land.

A new cumulative analysis needs to be conducted. A 3rd party launch failure analysis is needed due to the proximity of Port Isabel, Long Island Village and potentially three LNG export terminals (Annova LNG, Rio Grande LNG, Texas LNG) within 5 miles of the launch site. Public safety must be

the first and foremost consideration. Additionally, an analysis of the potential impacts to the proposed Jupiter LLC project, a crude upgrading, processing and export facility which includes an offshore loading facility 6 miles offshore. The cumulative analysis should also include impacts to climate change with regards to the value chain of SpaceX's operations (e.g. source of methane which is often fracked, condensing methane to liquid state, burning of fuels, etc.)

Considering the many changes since 2014, a 7 year period, and the scope of the Starship program, a new biological opinion is needed. The Starship is much larger, there will be more testing, more beach closures, and more traffic to SpaceX's facilities that are in an area where endangered wildlife is present. More closures of Boca Chica beach will result in increased inaccessibility to monitoring of endangered sea turtle nesting sites.

Since the Federal Aviation Administration already sent notice of preparing an EA, and if the FAA concludes a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) we request that the agency identify relevant areas of environmental concern, verify that EA supports the agency's determination that the potential impacts will be insignificant, and most importantly, identify mitigation measures that will be sufficient to reduce potential impacts below applicable significance thresholds and has ensured commitments to implement these measures. In other words, a Mitigated FONSI should be issued by the responsible FAA official. Additionally, I request the FAA enforce and/or hold SpaceX accountable to their required mitigation. Not all original 29 conditions from the EIS of 2014 were adhered to by SpaceX.

Joyce Hamilton
Harlingen, TX

JANUARY 21, 2021

Re: SpaceX proposal to conduct Starship/Super Heavy launch operations from the Boca Chica Launch Site in Cameron County, Texas.

I urge the FAA to conduct a new EIS for the SpaceX Starship/Super Heavy operations currently underway at SpaceX's Boca Chica site. From the 2014 FEIS, the objective of SpaceX's operations are entirely different, the launch vehicle is entirely different, and the size and scope of SpaceX is entirely different, which potentially in the future may include off-shore launches via superheavy-class spaceports, Superheavy re-landing on the launch stand, and a resort.

An EIS is in the interest of the public's concern to impacts that include accessibility of public lands, public safety, environment, wildlife, habitat, cumulative analysis of impacts, the unique characteristics of the geographic area (e.g., proximity to historic or cultural resources, parks, prime farmlands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers, ecologically critical areas, adverse impacts on endangered or threatened species or critical habitat; impacts that may be both beneficial and adverse. A significant impact may exist even if the Federal agency believes that on balance the impact will be beneficial; the degree to which the effects on the quality of the human environment are likely to be highly controversial; and whether the action is related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant impacts. Significance cannot be avoided by terming an action temporary or by breaking it down into component parts. An EIS most probably will more adequately address the differences and changes to SpaceX's operations. Ultimately, an EIS is needed to predict and mitigate anticipated consequences and prevent unintended consequences of SpaceX's proposals of the Starship program on the region of influence.

FAA should consider not just the "proposed project" and "no action" alternatives, but also other alternatives that include launches of Starship from an offshore platform or moving Starship launches to Cape Canaveral, for which the necessary infrastructure already exists and is situated further away from national wildlife refuge and/or state park land.

A new cumulative analysis needs to be conducted. A 3rd party launch failure analysis is needed due to the proximity of Port Isabel, Long Island Village and potentially three LNG export terminals (Annova LNG, Rio Grande LNG, Texas LNG) within 5 miles of the launch site. Public safety must be

the first and foremost consideration. Additionally, an analysis of the potential impacts to the proposed Jupiter LLC project, a crude upgrading, processing and export facility which includes an offshore loading facility 6 miles offshore. The cumulative analysis should also include impacts to climate change with regards to the value chain of SpaceX's operations (e.g. source of methane which is often fracked, condensing methane to liquid state, burning of fuels, etc.)

Considering the many changes since 2014, a 7 year period, and the scope of the Starship program, a new biological opinion is needed. The Starship is much larger, there will be more testing, more beach closures, and more traffic to SpaceX's facilities that are in an area where endangered wildlife is present. More closures of Boca Chica beach will result in increased inaccessibility to monitoring of endangered sea turtle nesting sites.

Since the Federal Aviation Administration already sent notice of preparing an EA, and if the FAA concludes a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) we request that the agency identify relevant areas of environmental concern, verify that EA supports the agency's determination that the potential impacts will be insignificant, and most importantly, identify mitigation measures that will be sufficient to reduce potential impacts below applicable significance thresholds and has ensured commitments to implement these measures. In other words, a Mitigated FONSI should be issued by the responsible FAA official. Additionally, I request the FAA enforce and/or hold SpaceX accountable to their required mitigation. Not all original 29 conditions from the EIS of 2014 were adhered to by SpaceX.

Karen Holleschau
Mercedes,, TX

JANUARY 21, 2021

Re: SpaceX proposal to conduct Starship/Super Heavy launch operations from the Boca Chica Launch Site in Cameron County, Texas.

I urge the FAA to conduct a new EIS for the SpaceX Starship/Super Heavy operations currently underway at SpaceX's Boca Chica site. From the 2014 FEIS, the objective of SpaceX's operations are entirely different, the launch vehicle is entirely different, and the size and scope of SpaceX is entirely different, which potentially in the future may include off-shore launches via superheavy-class spaceports, Superheavy re-landing on the launch stand, and a resort.

An EIS is in the interest of the public's concern to impacts that include accessibility of public lands, public safety, environment, wildlife, habitat, cumulative analysis of impacts, the unique characteristics of the geographic area (e.g., proximity to historic or cultural resources, parks, prime farmlands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers, ecologically critical areas, adverse impacts on endangered or threatened species or critical habitat; impacts that may be both beneficial and adverse. A significant impact may exist even if the Federal agency believes that on balance the impact will be beneficial; the degree to which the effects on the quality of the human environment are likely to be highly controversial; and whether the action is related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant impacts. Significance cannot be avoided by terming an action temporary or by breaking it down into component parts. An EIS most probably will more adequately address the differences and changes to SpaceX's operations. Ultimately, an EIS is needed to predict and mitigate anticipated consequences and prevent unintended consequences of SpaceX's proposals of the Starship program on the region of influence.

FAA should consider not just the "proposed project" and "no action" alternatives, but also other alternatives that include launches of Starship from an offshore platform or moving Starship launches to Cape Canaveral, for which the necessary infrastructure already exists and is situated further away from national wildlife refuge and/or state park land.

A new cumulative analysis needs to be conducted. A 3rd party launch failure analysis is needed due to the proximity of Port Isabel, Long Island Village and potentially three LNG export terminals (Annova LNG, Rio Grande LNG, Texas LNG) within 5 miles of the launch site. Public safety must be

the first and foremost consideration. Additionally, an analysis of the potential impacts to the proposed Jupiter LLC project, a crude upgrading, processing and export facility which includes an offshore loading facility 6 miles offshore. The cumulative analysis should also include impacts to climate change with regards to the value chain of SpaceX's operations (e.g. source of methane which is often fracked, condensing methane to liquid state, burning of fuels, etc.)

Considering the many changes since 2014, a 7 year period, and the scope of the Starship program, a new biological opinion is needed. The Starship is much larger, there will be more testing, more beach closures, and more traffic to SpaceX's facilities that are in an area where endangered wildlife is present. More closures of Boca Chica beach will result in increased inaccessibility to monitoring of endangered sea turtle nesting sites.

Since the Federal Aviation Administration already sent notice of preparing an EA, and if the FAA concludes a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) we request that the agency identify relevant areas of environmental concern, verify that EA supports the agency's determination that the potential impacts will be insignificant, and most importantly, identify mitigation measures that will be sufficient to reduce potential impacts below applicable significance thresholds and has ensured commitments to implement these measures. In other words, a Mitigated FONSI should be issued by the responsible FAA official. Additionally, I request the FAA enforce and/or hold SpaceX accountable to their required mitigation. Not all original 29 conditions from the EIS of 2014 were adhered to by SpaceX.

Ken Orgera
South Padre Island, TX

JANUARY 21, 2021

Re: SpaceX proposal to conduct Starship/Super Heavy launch operations from the Boca Chica Launch Site in Cameron County, Texas.

I urge the FAA to conduct a new EIS for the SpaceX Starship/Super Heavy operations currently underway at SpaceX's Boca Chica site. From the 2014 FEIS, the objective of SpaceX's operations are entirely different, the launch vehicle is entirely different, and the size and scope of SpaceX is entirely different, which potentially in the future may include off-shore launches via superheavy-class spaceports, Superheavy re-landing on the launch stand, and a resort.

An EIS is in the interest of the public's concern to impacts that include accessibility of public lands, public safety, environment, wildlife, habitat, cumulative analysis of impacts, the unique characteristics of the geographic area (e.g., proximity to historic or cultural resources, parks, prime farmlands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers, ecologically critical areas, adverse impacts on endangered or threatened species or critical habitat; impacts that may be both beneficial and adverse. A significant impact may exist even if the Federal agency believes that on balance the impact will be beneficial; the degree to which the effects on the quality of the human environment are likely to be highly controversial; and whether the action is related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant impacts. Significance cannot be avoided by terming an action temporary or by breaking it down into component parts. An EIS most probably will more adequately address the differences and changes to SpaceX's operations. Ultimately, an EIS is needed to predict and mitigate anticipated consequences and prevent unintended consequences of SpaceX's proposals of the Starship program on the region of influence.

FAA should consider not just the "proposed project" and "no action" alternatives, but also other alternatives that include launches of Starship from an offshore platform or moving Starship launches to Cape Canaveral, for which the necessary infrastructure already exists and is situated further away from national wildlife refuge and/or state park land.

A new cumulative analysis needs to be conducted. A 3rd party launch failure analysis is needed due to the proximity of Port Isabel, Long Island Village and potentially three LNG export terminals (Annova LNG, Rio Grande LNG, Texas LNG) within 5 miles of the launch site. Public safety must be

the first and foremost consideration. Additionally, an analysis of the potential impacts to the proposed Jupiter LLC project, a crude upgrading, processing and export facility which includes an offshore loading facility 6 miles offshore. The cumulative analysis should also include impacts to climate change with regards to the value chain of SpaceX's operations (e.g. source of methane which is often fracked, condensing methane to liquid state, burning of fuels, etc.)

Considering the many changes since 2014, a 7 year period, and the scope of the Starship program, a new biological opinion is needed. The Starship is much larger, there will be more testing, more beach closures, and more traffic to SpaceX's facilities that are in an area where endangered wildlife is present. More closures of Boca Chica beach will result in increased inaccessibility to monitoring of endangered sea turtle nesting sites.

Since the Federal Aviation Administration already sent notice of preparing an EA, and if the FAA concludes a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) we request that the agency identify relevant areas of environmental concern, verify that EA supports the agency's determination that the potential impacts will be insignificant, and most importantly, identify mitigation measures that will be sufficient to reduce potential impacts below applicable significance thresholds and has ensured commitments to implement these measures. In other words, a Mitigated FONSI should be issued by the responsible FAA official. Additionally, I request the FAA enforce and/or hold SpaceX accountable to their required mitigation. Not all original 29 conditions from the EIS of 2014 were adhered to by SpaceX.

Kim Kirby
Port Isabel, TX

JANUARY 21, 2021

Re: SpaceX proposal to conduct Starship/Super Heavy launch operations from the Boca Chica Launch Site in Cameron County, Texas.

I urge the FAA to conduct a new EIS for the SpaceX Starship/Super Heavy operations currently underway at SpaceX's Boca Chica site. From the 2014 FEIS, the objective of SpaceX's operations are entirely different, the launch vehicle is entirely different, and the size and scope of SpaceX is entirely different, which potentially in the future may include off-shore launches via superheavy-class spaceports, Superheavy re-landing on the launch stand, and a resort.

An EIS is in the interest of the public's concern to impacts that include accessibility of public lands, public safety, environment, wildlife, habitat, cumulative analysis of impacts, the unique characteristics of the geographic area (e.g., proximity to historic or cultural resources, parks, prime farmlands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers, ecologically critical areas, adverse impacts on endangered or threatened species or critical habitat; impacts that may be both beneficial and adverse. A significant impact may exist even if the Federal agency believes that on balance the impact will be beneficial; the degree to which the effects on the quality of the human environment are likely to be highly controversial; and whether the action is related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant impacts. Significance cannot be avoided by terming an action temporary or by breaking it down into component parts. An EIS most probably will more adequately address the differences and changes to SpaceX's operations. Ultimately, an EIS is needed to predict and mitigate anticipated consequences and prevent unintended consequences of SpaceX's proposals of the Starship program on the region of influence.

FAA should consider not just the "proposed project" and "no action" alternatives, but also other alternatives that include launches of Starship from an offshore platform or moving Starship launches to Cape Canaveral, for which the necessary infrastructure already exists and is situated further away from national wildlife refuge and/or state park land.

A new cumulative analysis needs to be conducted. A 3rd party launch failure analysis is needed due to the proximity of Port Isabel, Long Island Village and potentially three LNG export terminals (Annova LNG, Rio Grande LNG, Texas LNG) within 5 miles of the launch site. Public safety must be

the first and foremost consideration. Additionally, an analysis of the potential impacts to the proposed Jupiter LLC project, a crude upgrading, processing and export facility which includes an offshore loading facility 6 miles offshore. The cumulative analysis should also include impacts to climate change with regards to the value chain of SpaceX's operations (e.g. source of methane which is often fracked, condensing methane to liquid state, burning of fuels, etc.)

Considering the many changes since 2014, a 7 year period, and the scope of the Starship program, a new biological opinion is needed. The Starship is much larger, there will be more testing, more beach closures, and more traffic to SpaceX's facilities that are in an area where endangered wildlife is present. More closures of Boca Chica beach will result in increased inaccessibility to monitoring of endangered sea turtle nesting sites.

Since the Federal Aviation Administration already sent notice of preparing an EA, and if the FAA concludes a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) we request that the agency identify relevant areas of environmental concern, verify that EA supports the agency's determination that the potential impacts will be insignificant, and most importantly, identify mitigation measures that will be sufficient to reduce potential impacts below applicable significance thresholds and has ensured commitments to implement these measures. In other words, a Mitigated FONSI should be issued by the responsible FAA official. Additionally, I request the FAA enforce and/or hold SpaceX accountable to their required mitigation. Not all original 29 conditions from the EIS of 2014 were adhered to by SpaceX.

Letty Martinez-Roerig
Brownsville, TX

JANUARY 21, 2021

Re: SpaceX proposal to conduct Starship/Super Heavy launch operations from the Boca Chica Launch Site in Cameron County, Texas.

I urge the FAA to conduct a new EIS for the SpaceX Starship/Super Heavy operations currently underway at SpaceX's Boca Chica site. From the 2014 FEIS, the objective of SpaceX's operations are entirely different, the launch vehicle is entirely different, and the size and scope of SpaceX is entirely different, which potentially in the future may include off-shore launches via superheavy-class spaceports, Superheavy re-landing on the launch stand, and a resort.

An EIS is in the interest of the public's concern to impacts that include accessibility of public lands, public safety, environment, wildlife, habitat, cumulative analysis of impacts, the unique characteristics of the geographic area (e.g., proximity to historic or cultural resources, parks, prime farmlands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers, ecologically critical areas, adverse impacts on endangered or threatened species or critical habitat; impacts that may be both beneficial and adverse. A significant impact may exist even if the Federal agency believes that on balance the impact will be beneficial; the degree to which the effects on the quality of the human environment are likely to be highly controversial; and whether the action is related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant impacts. Significance cannot be avoided by terming an action temporary or by breaking it down into component parts. An EIS most probably will more adequately address the differences and changes to SpaceX's operations. Ultimately, an EIS is needed to predict and mitigate anticipated consequences and prevent unintended consequences of SpaceX's proposals of the Starship program on the region of influence.

FAA should consider not just the "proposed project" and "no action" alternatives, but also other alternatives that include launches of Starship from an offshore platform or moving Starship launches to Cape Canaveral, for which the necessary infrastructure already exists and is situated further away from national wildlife refuge and/or state park land.

A new cumulative analysis needs to be conducted. A 3rd party launch failure analysis is needed due to the proximity of Port Isabel, Long Island Village and potentially three LNG export terminals (Annova LNG, Rio Grande LNG, Texas LNG) within 5 miles of the launch site. Public safety must be

the first and foremost consideration. Additionally, an analysis of the potential impacts to the proposed Jupiter LLC project, a crude upgrading, processing and export facility which includes an offshore loading facility 6 miles offshore. The cumulative analysis should also include impacts to climate change with regards to the value chain of SpaceX's operations (e.g. source of methane which is often fracked, condensing methane to liquid state, burning of fuels, etc.)

Considering the many changes since 2014, a 7 year period, and the scope of the Starship program, a new biological opinion is needed. The Starship is much larger, there will be more testing, more beach closures, and more traffic to SpaceX's facilities that are in an area where endangered wildlife is present. More closures of Boca Chica beach will result in increased inaccessibility to monitoring of endangered sea turtle nesting sites.

Since the Federal Aviation Administration already sent notice of preparing an EA, and if the FAA concludes a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) we request that the agency identify relevant areas of environmental concern, verify that EA supports the agency's determination that the potential impacts will be insignificant, and most importantly, identify mitigation measures that will be sufficient to reduce potential impacts below applicable significance thresholds and has ensured commitments to implement these measures. In other words, a Mitigated FONSI should be issued by the responsible FAA official. Additionally, I request the FAA enforce and/or hold SpaceX accountable to their required mitigation. Not all original 29 conditions from the EIS of 2014 were adhered to by SpaceX.

Lisa Silguero
Austin, TX

JANUARY 21, 2021

Re: SpaceX proposal to conduct Starship/Super Heavy launch operations from the Boca Chica Launch Site in Cameron County, Texas.

I urge the FAA to conduct a new EIS for the SpaceX Starship/Super Heavy operations currently underway at SpaceX's Boca Chica site. From the 2014 FEIS, the objective of SpaceX's operations are entirely different, the launch vehicle is entirely different, and the size and scope of SpaceX is entirely different, which potentially in the future may include off-shore launches via superheavy-class spaceports, Superheavy re-landing on the launch stand, and a resort.

An EIS is in the interest of the public's concern to impacts that include accessibility of public lands, public safety, environment, wildlife, habitat, cumulative analysis of impacts, the unique characteristics of the geographic area (e.g., proximity to historic or cultural resources, parks, prime farmlands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers, ecologically critical areas, adverse impacts on endangered or threatened species or critical habitat; impacts that may be both beneficial and adverse. A significant impact may exist even if the Federal agency believes that on balance the impact will be beneficial; the degree to which the effects on the quality of the human environment are likely to be highly controversial; and whether the action is related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant impacts. Significance cannot be avoided by terming an action temporary or by breaking it down into component parts. An EIS most probably will more adequately address the differences and changes to SpaceX's operations. Ultimately, an EIS is needed to predict and mitigate anticipated consequences and prevent unintended consequences of SpaceX's proposals of the Starship program on the region of influence.

FAA should consider not just the "proposed project" and "no action" alternatives, but also other alternatives that include launches of Starship from an offshore platform or moving Starship launches to Cape Canaveral, for which the necessary infrastructure already exists and is situated further away from national wildlife refuge and/or state park land.

A new cumulative analysis needs to be conducted. A 3rd party launch failure analysis is needed due to the proximity of Port Isabel, Long Island Village and potentially three LNG export terminals (Annova LNG, Rio Grande LNG, Texas LNG) within 5 miles of the launch site. Public safety must be

the first and foremost consideration. Additionally, an analysis of the potential impacts to the proposed Jupiter LLC project, a crude upgrading, processing and export facility which includes an offshore loading facility 6 miles offshore. The cumulative analysis should also include impacts to climate change with regards to the value chain of SpaceX's operations (e.g. source of methane which is often fracked, condensing methane to liquid state, burning of fuels, etc.)

Considering the many changes since 2014, a 7 year period, and the scope of the Starship program, a new biological opinion is needed. The Starship is much larger, there will be more testing, more beach closures, and more traffic to SpaceX's facilities that are in an area where endangered wildlife is present. More closures of Boca Chica beach will result in increased inaccessibility to monitoring of endangered sea turtle nesting sites.

Since the Federal Aviation Administration already sent notice of preparing an EA, and if the FAA concludes a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) we request that the agency identify relevant areas of environmental concern, verify that EA supports the agency's determination that the potential impacts will be insignificant, and most importantly, identify mitigation measures that will be sufficient to reduce potential impacts below applicable significance thresholds and has ensured commitments to implement these measures. In other words, a Mitigated FONSI should be issued by the responsible FAA official. Additionally, I request the FAA enforce and/or hold SpaceX accountable to their required mitigation. Not all original 29 conditions from the EIS of 2014 were adhered to by SpaceX.

Lydia Flores
Santa Rosa, TX

JANUARY 21, 2021

Re: SpaceX proposal to conduct Starship/Super Heavy launch operations from the Boca Chica Launch Site in Cameron County, Texas.

I urge the FAA to conduct a new EIS for the SpaceX Starship/Super Heavy operations currently underway at SpaceX's Boca Chica site. From the 2014 FEIS, the objective of SpaceX's operations are entirely different, the launch vehicle is entirely different, and the size and scope of SpaceX is entirely different, which potentially in the future may include off-shore launches via superheavy-class spaceports, Superheavy re-landing on the launch stand, and a resort.

An EIS is in the interest of the public's concern to impacts that include accessibility of public lands, public safety, environment, wildlife, habitat, cumulative analysis of impacts, the unique characteristics of the geographic area (e.g., proximity to historic or cultural resources, parks, prime farmlands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers, ecologically critical areas, adverse impacts on endangered or threatened species or critical habitat; impacts that may be both beneficial and adverse. A significant impact may exist even if the Federal agency believes that on balance the impact will be beneficial; the degree to which the effects on the quality of the human environment are likely to be highly controversial; and whether the action is related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant impacts. Significance cannot be avoided by terming an action temporary or by breaking it down into component parts. An EIS most probably will more adequately address the differences and changes to SpaceX's operations. Ultimately, an EIS is needed to predict and mitigate anticipated consequences and prevent unintended consequences of SpaceX's proposals of the Starship program on the region of influence.

FAA should consider not just the "proposed project" and "no action" alternatives, but also other alternatives that include launches of Starship from an offshore platform or moving Starship launches to Cape Canaveral, for which the necessary infrastructure already exists and is situated further away from national wildlife refuge and/or state park land.

A new cumulative analysis needs to be conducted. A 3rd party launch failure analysis is needed due to the proximity of Port Isabel, Long Island Village and potentially three LNG export terminals (Annova LNG, Rio Grande LNG, Texas LNG) within 5 miles of the launch site. Public safety must be

the first and foremost consideration. Additionally, an analysis of the potential impacts to the proposed Jupiter LLC project, a crude upgrading, processing and export facility which includes an offshore loading facility 6 miles offshore. The cumulative analysis should also include impacts to climate change with regards to the value chain of SpaceX's operations (e.g. source of methane which is often fracked, condensing methane to liquid state, burning of fuels, etc.)

Considering the many changes since 2014, a 7 year period, and the scope of the Starship program, a new biological opinion is needed. The Starship is much larger, there will be more testing, more beach closures, and more traffic to SpaceX's facilities that are in an area where endangered wildlife is present. More closures of Boca Chica beach will result in increased inaccessibility to monitoring of endangered sea turtle nesting sites.

Since the Federal Aviation Administration already sent notice of preparing an EA, and if the FAA concludes a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) we request that the agency identify relevant areas of environmental concern, verify that EA supports the agency's determination that the potential impacts will be insignificant, and most importantly, identify mitigation measures that will be sufficient to reduce potential impacts below applicable significance thresholds and has ensured commitments to implement these measures. In other words, a Mitigated FONSI should be issued by the responsible FAA official. Additionally, I request the FAA enforce and/or hold SpaceX accountable to their required mitigation. Not all original 29 conditions from the EIS of 2014 were adhered to by SpaceX.

Maria Galasso
Laguna Vista, TX

JANUARY 21, 2021

Re: SpaceX proposal to conduct Starship/Super Heavy launch operations from the Boca Chica Launch Site in Cameron County, Texas.

I urge the FAA to conduct a new EIS for the SpaceX Starship/Super Heavy operations currently underway at SpaceX's Boca Chica site. From the 2014 FEIS, the objective of SpaceX's operations are entirely different, the launch vehicle is entirely different, and the size and scope of SpaceX is entirely different, which potentially in the future may include off-shore launches via superheavy-class spaceports, Superheavy re-landing on the launch stand, and a resort.

An EIS is in the interest of the public's concern to impacts that include accessibility of public lands, public safety, environment, wildlife, habitat, cumulative analysis of impacts, the unique characteristics of the geographic area (e.g., proximity to historic or cultural resources, parks, prime farmlands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers, ecologically critical areas, adverse impacts on endangered or threatened species or critical habitat; impacts that may be both beneficial and adverse. A significant impact may exist even if the Federal agency believes that on balance the impact will be beneficial; the degree to which the effects on the quality of the human environment are likely to be highly controversial; and whether the action is related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant impacts. Significance cannot be avoided by terming an action temporary or by breaking it down into component parts. An EIS most probably will more adequately address the differences and changes to SpaceX's operations. Ultimately, an EIS is needed to predict and mitigate anticipated consequences and prevent unintended consequences of SpaceX's proposals of the Starship program on the region of influence.

FAA should consider not just the "proposed project" and "no action" alternatives, but also other alternatives that include launches of Starship from an offshore platform or moving Starship launches to Cape Canaveral, for which the necessary infrastructure already exists and is situated further away from national wildlife refuge and/or state park land.

A new cumulative analysis needs to be conducted. A 3rd party launch failure analysis is needed due to the proximity of Port Isabel, Long Island Village and potentially three LNG export terminals (Annova LNG, Rio Grande LNG, Texas LNG) within 5 miles of the launch site. Public safety must be

the first and foremost consideration. Additionally, an analysis of the potential impacts to the proposed Jupiter LLC project, a crude upgrading, processing and export facility which includes an offshore loading facility 6 miles offshore. The cumulative analysis should also include impacts to climate change with regards to the value chain of SpaceX's operations (e.g. source of methane which is often fracked, condensing methane to liquid state, burning of fuels, etc.)

Considering the many changes since 2014, a 7 year period, and the scope of the Starship program, a new biological opinion is needed. The Starship is much larger, there will be more testing, more beach closures, and more traffic to SpaceX's facilities that are in an area where endangered wildlife is present. More closures of Boca Chica beach will result in increased inaccessibility to monitoring of endangered sea turtle nesting sites.

Since the Federal Aviation Administration already sent notice of preparing an EA, and if the FAA concludes a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) we request that the agency identify relevant areas of environmental concern, verify that EA supports the agency's determination that the potential impacts will be insignificant, and most importantly, identify mitigation measures that will be sufficient to reduce potential impacts below applicable significance thresholds and has ensured commitments to implement these measures. In other words, a Mitigated FONSI should be issued by the responsible FAA official. Additionally, I request the FAA enforce and/or hold SpaceX accountable to their required mitigation. Not all original 29 conditions from the EIS of 2014 were adhered to by SpaceX.

Mary Brown
Las Cruces, NM

JANUARY 21, 2021

Re: SpaceX proposal to conduct Starship/Super Heavy launch operations from the Boca Chica Launch Site in Cameron County, Texas.

I urge the FAA to conduct a new EIS for the SpaceX Starship/Super Heavy operations currently underway at SpaceX's Boca Chica site. From the 2014 FEIS, the objective of SpaceX's operations are entirely different, the launch vehicle is entirely different, and the size and scope of SpaceX is entirely different, which potentially in the future may include off-shore launches via superheavy-class spaceports, Superheavy re-landing on the launch stand, and a resort.

An EIS is in the interest of the public's concern to impacts that include accessibility of public lands, public safety, environment, wildlife, habitat, cumulative analysis of impacts, the unique characteristics of the geographic area (e.g., proximity to historic or cultural resources, parks, prime farmlands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers, ecologically critical areas, adverse impacts on endangered or threatened species or critical habitat; impacts that may be both beneficial and adverse. A significant impact may exist even if the Federal agency believes that on balance the impact will be beneficial; the degree to which the effects on the quality of the human environment are likely to be highly controversial; and whether the action is related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant impacts. Significance cannot be avoided by terming an action temporary or by breaking it down into component parts. An EIS most probably will more adequately address the differences and changes to SpaceX's operations. Ultimately, an EIS is needed to predict and mitigate anticipated consequences and prevent unintended consequences of SpaceX's proposals of the Starship program on the region of influence.

FAA should consider not just the "proposed project" and "no action" alternatives, but also other alternatives that include launches of Starship from an offshore platform or moving Starship launches to Cape Canaveral, for which the necessary infrastructure already exists and is situated further away from national wildlife refuge and/or state park land.

A new cumulative analysis needs to be conducted. A 3rd party launch failure analysis is needed due to the proximity of Port Isabel, Long Island Village and potentially three LNG export terminals (Annova LNG, Rio Grande LNG, Texas LNG) within 5 miles of the launch site. Public safety must be

the first and foremost consideration. Additionally, an analysis of the potential impacts to the proposed Jupiter LLC project, a crude upgrading, processing and export facility which includes an offshore loading facility 6 miles offshore. The cumulative analysis should also include impacts to climate change with regards to the value chain of SpaceX's operations (e.g. source of methane which is often fracked, condensing methane to liquid state, burning of fuels, etc.)

Considering the many changes since 2014, a 7 year period, and the scope of the Starship program, a new biological opinion is needed. The Starship is much larger, there will be more testing, more beach closures, and more traffic to SpaceX's facilities that are in an area where endangered wildlife is present. More closures of Boca Chica beach will result in increased inaccessibility to monitoring of endangered sea turtle nesting sites.

Since the Federal Aviation Administration already sent notice of preparing an EA, and if the FAA concludes a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) we request that the agency identify relevant areas of environmental concern, verify that EA supports the agency's determination that the potential impacts will be insignificant, and most importantly, identify mitigation measures that will be sufficient to reduce potential impacts below applicable significance thresholds and has ensured commitments to implement these measures. In other words, a Mitigated FONSI should be issued by the responsible FAA official. Additionally, I request the FAA enforce and/or hold SpaceX accountable to their required mitigation. Not all original 29 conditions from the EIS of 2014 were adhered to by SpaceX.

Mary Elizabeth Hollmann
Brownsville, TX

JANUARY 21, 2021

Re: SpaceX proposal to conduct Starship/Super Heavy launch operations from the Boca Chica Launch Site in Cameron County, Texas.

I urge the FAA to conduct a new EIS for the SpaceX Starship/Super Heavy operations currently underway at SpaceX's Boca Chica site. From the 2014 FEIS, the objective of SpaceX's operations are entirely different, the launch vehicle is entirely different, and the size and scope of SpaceX is entirely different, which potentially in the future may include off-shore launches via superheavy-class spaceports, Superheavy re-landing on the launch stand, and a resort.

An EIS is in the interest of the public's concern to impacts that include accessibility of public lands, public safety, environment, wildlife, habitat, cumulative analysis of impacts, the unique characteristics of the geographic area (e.g., proximity to historic or cultural resources, parks, prime farmlands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers, ecologically critical areas, adverse impacts on endangered or threatened species or critical habitat; impacts that may be both beneficial and adverse. A significant impact may exist even if the Federal agency believes that on balance the impact will be beneficial; the degree to which the effects on the quality of the human environment are likely to be highly controversial; and whether the action is related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant impacts. Significance cannot be avoided by terming an action temporary or by breaking it down into component parts. An EIS most probably will more adequately address the differences and changes to SpaceX's operations. Ultimately, an EIS is needed to predict and mitigate anticipated consequences and prevent unintended consequences of SpaceX's proposals of the Starship program on the region of influence.

FAA should consider not just the "proposed project" and "no action" alternatives, but also other alternatives that include launches of Starship from an offshore platform or moving Starship launches to Cape Canaveral, for which the necessary infrastructure already exists and is situated further away from national wildlife refuge and/or state park land.

A new cumulative analysis needs to be conducted. A 3rd party launch failure analysis is needed due to the proximity of Port Isabel, Long Island Village and potentially three LNG export terminals (Annova LNG, Rio Grande LNG, Texas LNG) within 5 miles of the launch site. Public safety must be

the first and foremost consideration. Additionally, an analysis of the potential impacts to the proposed Jupiter LLC project, a crude upgrading, processing and export facility which includes an offshore loading facility 6 miles offshore. The cumulative analysis should also include impacts to climate change with regards to the value chain of SpaceX's operations (e.g. source of methane which is often fracked, condensing methane to liquid state, burning of fuels, etc.)

Considering the many changes since 2014, a 7 year period, and the scope of the Starship program, a new biological opinion is needed. The Starship is much larger, there will be more testing, more beach closures, and more traffic to SpaceX's facilities that are in an area where endangered wildlife is present. More closures of Boca Chica beach will result in increased inaccessibility to monitoring of endangered sea turtle nesting sites.

Since the Federal Aviation Administration already sent notice of preparing an EA, and if the FAA concludes a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) we request that the agency identify relevant areas of environmental concern, verify that EA supports the agency's determination that the potential impacts will be insignificant, and most importantly, identify mitigation measures that will be sufficient to reduce potential impacts below applicable significance thresholds and has ensured commitments to implement these measures. In other words, a Mitigated FONSI should be issued by the responsible FAA official. Additionally, I request the FAA enforce and/or hold SpaceX accountable to their required mitigation. Not all original 29 conditions from the EIS of 2014 were adhered to by SpaceX.

Mary Volz
Laguna Vista, TX

JANUARY 21, 2021

Re: SpaceX proposal to conduct Starship/Super Heavy launch operations from the Boca Chica Launch Site in Cameron County, Texas.

I urge the FAA to conduct a new EIS for the SpaceX Starship/Super Heavy operations currently underway at SpaceX's Boca Chica site. From the 2014 FEIS, the objective of SpaceX's operations are entirely different, the launch vehicle is entirely different, and the size and scope of SpaceX is entirely different, which potentially in the future may include off-shore launches via superheavy-class spaceports, Superheavy re-landing on the launch stand, and a resort.

An EIS is in the interest of the public's concern to impacts that include accessibility of public lands, public safety, environment, wildlife, habitat, cumulative analysis of impacts, the unique characteristics of the geographic area (e.g., proximity to historic or cultural resources, parks, prime farmlands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers, ecologically critical areas, adverse impacts on endangered or threatened species or critical habitat; impacts that may be both beneficial and adverse. A significant impact may exist even if the Federal agency believes that on balance the impact will be beneficial; the degree to which the effects on the quality of the human environment are likely to be highly controversial; and whether the action is related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant impacts. Significance cannot be avoided by terming an action temporary or by breaking it down into component parts. An EIS most probably will more adequately address the differences and changes to SpaceX's operations. Ultimately, an EIS is needed to predict and mitigate anticipated consequences and prevent unintended consequences of SpaceX's proposals of the Starship program on the region of influence.

FAA should consider not just the "proposed project" and "no action" alternatives, but also other alternatives that include launches of Starship from an offshore platform or moving Starship launches to Cape Canaveral, for which the necessary infrastructure already exists and is situated further away from national wildlife refuge and/or state park land.

A new cumulative analysis needs to be conducted. A 3rd party launch failure analysis is needed due to the proximity of Port Isabel, Long Island Village and potentially three LNG export terminals (Annova LNG, Rio Grande LNG, Texas LNG) within 5 miles of the launch site. Public safety must be

the first and foremost consideration. Additionally, an analysis of the potential impacts to the proposed Jupiter LLC project, a crude upgrading, processing and export facility which includes an offshore loading facility 6 miles offshore. The cumulative analysis should also include impacts to climate change with regards to the value chain of SpaceX's operations (e.g. source of methane which is often fracked, condensing methane to liquid state, burning of fuels, etc.)

Considering the many changes since 2014, a 7 year period, and the scope of the Starship program, a new biological opinion is needed. The Starship is much larger, there will be more testing, more beach closures, and more traffic to SpaceX's facilities that are in an area where endangered wildlife is present. More closures of Boca Chica beach will result in increased inaccessibility to monitoring of endangered sea turtle nesting sites.

Since the Federal Aviation Administration already sent notice of preparing an EA, and if the FAA concludes a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) we request that the agency identify relevant areas of environmental concern, verify that EA supports the agency's determination that the potential impacts will be insignificant, and most importantly, identify mitigation measures that will be sufficient to reduce potential impacts below applicable significance thresholds and has ensured commitments to implement these measures. In other words, a Mitigated FONSI should be issued by the responsible FAA official. Additionally, I request the FAA enforce and/or hold SpaceX accountable to their required mitigation. Not all original 29 conditions from the EIS of 2014 were adhered to by SpaceX.

Nohemi Benitez
Donna, TX

JANUARY 21, 2021

Re: SpaceX proposal to conduct Starship/Super Heavy launch operations from the Boca Chica Launch Site in Cameron County, Texas.

I urge the FAA to conduct a new EIS for the SpaceX Starship/Super Heavy operations currently underway at SpaceX's Boca Chica site. From the 2014 FEIS, the objective of SpaceX's operations are entirely different, the launch vehicle is entirely different, and the size and scope of SpaceX is entirely different, which potentially in the future may include off-shore launches via superheavy-class spaceports, Superheavy re-landing on the launch stand, and a resort.

An EIS is in the interest of the public's concern to impacts that include accessibility of public lands, public safety, environment, wildlife, habitat, cumulative analysis of impacts, the unique characteristics of the geographic area (e.g., proximity to historic or cultural resources, parks, prime farmlands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers, ecologically critical areas, adverse impacts on endangered or threatened species or critical habitat; impacts that may be both beneficial and adverse. A significant impact may exist even if the Federal agency believes that on balance the impact will be beneficial; the degree to which the effects on the quality of the human environment are likely to be highly controversial; and whether the action is related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant impacts. Significance cannot be avoided by terming an action temporary or by breaking it down into component parts. An EIS most probably will more adequately address the differences and changes to SpaceX's operations. Ultimately, an EIS is needed to predict and mitigate anticipated consequences and prevent unintended consequences of SpaceX's proposals of the Starship program on the region of influence.

FAA should consider not just the "proposed project" and "no action" alternatives, but also other alternatives that include launches of Starship from an offshore platform or moving Starship launches to Cape Canaveral, for which the necessary infrastructure already exists and is situated further away from national wildlife refuge and/or state park land.

A new cumulative analysis needs to be conducted. A 3rd party launch failure analysis is needed due to the proximity of Port Isabel, Long Island Village and potentially three LNG export terminals (Annova LNG, Rio Grande LNG, Texas LNG) within 5 miles of the launch site. Public safety must be

the first and foremost consideration. Additionally, an analysis of the potential impacts to the proposed Jupiter LLC project, a crude upgrading, processing and export facility which includes an offshore loading facility 6 miles offshore. The cumulative analysis should also include impacts to climate change with regards to the value chain of SpaceX's operations (e.g. source of methane which is often fracked, condensing methane to liquid state, burning of fuels, etc.)

Considering the many changes since 2014, a 7 year period, and the scope of the Starship program, a new biological opinion is needed. The Starship is much larger, there will be more testing, more beach closures, and more traffic to SpaceX's facilities that are in an area where endangered wildlife is present. More closures of Boca Chica beach will result in increased inaccessibility to monitoring of endangered sea turtle nesting sites.

Since the Federal Aviation Administration already sent notice of preparing an EA, and if the FAA concludes a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) we request that the agency identify relevant areas of environmental concern, verify that EA supports the agency's determination that the potential impacts will be insignificant, and most importantly, identify mitigation measures that will be sufficient to reduce potential impacts below applicable significance thresholds and has ensured commitments to implement these measures. In other words, a Mitigated FONSI should be issued by the responsible FAA official. Additionally, I request the FAA enforce and/or hold SpaceX accountable to their required mitigation. Not all original 29 conditions from the EIS of 2014 were adhered to by SpaceX.

Patricia Garcia
Brownsville, TX

JANUARY 21, 2021

Re: SpaceX proposal to conduct Starship/Super Heavy launch operations from the Boca Chica Launch Site in Cameron County, Texas.

I urge the FAA to conduct a new EIS for the SpaceX Starship/Super Heavy operations currently underway at SpaceX's Boca Chica site. From the 2014 FEIS, the objective of SpaceX's operations are entirely different, the launch vehicle is entirely different, and the size and scope of SpaceX is entirely different, which potentially in the future may include off-shore launches via superheavy-class spaceports, Superheavy re-landing on the launch stand, and a resort.

An EIS is in the interest of the public's concern to impacts that include accessibility of public lands, public safety, environment, wildlife, habitat, cumulative analysis of impacts, the unique characteristics of the geographic area (e.g., proximity to historic or cultural resources, parks, prime farmlands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers, ecologically critical areas, adverse impacts on endangered or threatened species or critical habitat; impacts that may be both beneficial and adverse. A significant impact may exist even if the Federal agency believes that on balance the impact will be beneficial; the degree to which the effects on the quality of the human environment are likely to be highly controversial; and whether the action is related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant impacts. Significance cannot be avoided by terming an action temporary or by breaking it down into component parts. An EIS most probably will more adequately address the differences and changes to SpaceX's operations. Ultimately, an EIS is needed to predict and mitigate anticipated consequences and prevent unintended consequences of SpaceX's proposals of the Starship program on the region of influence.

FAA should consider not just the "proposed project" and "no action" alternatives, but also other alternatives that include launches of Starship from an offshore platform or moving Starship launches to Cape Canaveral, for which the necessary infrastructure already exists and is situated further away from national wildlife refuge and/or state park land.

A new cumulative analysis needs to be conducted. A 3rd party launch failure analysis is needed due to the proximity of Port Isabel, Long Island Village and potentially three LNG export terminals (Annova LNG, Rio Grande LNG, Texas LNG) within 5 miles of the launch site. Public safety must be

the first and foremost consideration. Additionally, an analysis of the potential impacts to the proposed Jupiter LLC project, a crude upgrading, processing and export facility which includes an offshore loading facility 6 miles offshore. The cumulative analysis should also include impacts to climate change with regards to the value chain of SpaceX's operations (e.g. source of methane which is often fracked, condensing methane to liquid state, burning of fuels, etc.)

Considering the many changes since 2014, a 7 year period, and the scope of the Starship program, a new biological opinion is needed. The Starship is much larger, there will be more testing, more beach closures, and more traffic to SpaceX's facilities that are in an area where endangered wildlife is present. More closures of Boca Chica beach will result in increased inaccessibility to monitoring of endangered sea turtle nesting sites.

Since the Federal Aviation Administration already sent notice of preparing an EA, and if the FAA concludes a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) we request that the agency identify relevant areas of environmental concern, verify that EA supports the agency's determination that the potential impacts will be insignificant, and most importantly, identify mitigation measures that will be sufficient to reduce potential impacts below applicable significance thresholds and has ensured commitments to implement these measures. In other words, a Mitigated FONSI should be issued by the responsible FAA official. Additionally, I request the FAA enforce and/or hold SpaceX accountable to their required mitigation. Not all original 29 conditions from the EIS of 2014 were adhered to by SpaceX.

Raymond Everitt
Brownsville, TX

JANUARY 21, 2021

Re: SpaceX proposal to conduct Starship/Super Heavy launch operations from the Boca Chica Launch Site in Cameron County, Texas.

I urge the FAA to conduct a new EIS for the SpaceX Starship/Super Heavy operations currently underway at SpaceX's Boca Chica site. From the 2014 FEIS, the objective of SpaceX's operations are entirely different, the launch vehicle is entirely different, and the size and scope of SpaceX is entirely different, which potentially in the future may include off-shore launches via superheavy-class spaceports, Superheavy re-landing on the launch stand, and a resort.

An EIS is in the interest of the public's concern to impacts that include accessibility of public lands, public safety, environment, wildlife, habitat, cumulative analysis of impacts, the unique characteristics of the geographic area (e.g., proximity to historic or cultural resources, parks, prime farmlands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers, ecologically critical areas, adverse impacts on endangered or threatened species or critical habitat; impacts that may be both beneficial and adverse. A significant impact may exist even if the Federal agency believes that on balance the impact will be beneficial; the degree to which the effects on the quality of the human environment are likely to be highly controversial; and whether the action is related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant impacts. Significance cannot be avoided by terming an action temporary or by breaking it down into component parts. An EIS most probably will more adequately address the differences and changes to SpaceX's operations. Ultimately, an EIS is needed to predict and mitigate anticipated consequences and prevent unintended consequences of SpaceX's proposals of the Starship program on the region of influence.

FAA should consider not just the "proposed project" and "no action" alternatives, but also other alternatives that include launches of Starship from an offshore platform or moving Starship launches to Cape Canaveral, for which the necessary infrastructure already exists and is situated further away from national wildlife refuge and/or state park land.

A new cumulative analysis needs to be conducted. A 3rd party launch failure analysis is needed due to the proximity of Port Isabel, Long Island Village and potentially three LNG export terminals (Annova LNG, Rio Grande LNG, Texas LNG) within 5 miles of the launch site. Public safety must be

the first and foremost consideration. Additionally, an analysis of the potential impacts to the proposed Jupiter LLC project, a crude upgrading, processing and export facility which includes an offshore loading facility 6 miles offshore. The cumulative analysis should also include impacts to climate change with regards to the value chain of SpaceX's operations (e.g. source of methane which is often fracked, condensing methane to liquid state, burning of fuels, etc.)

Considering the many changes since 2014, a 7 year period, and the scope of the Starship program, a new biological opinion is needed. The Starship is much larger, there will be more testing, more beach closures, and more traffic to SpaceX's facilities that are in an area where endangered wildlife is present. More closures of Boca Chica beach will result in increased inaccessibility to monitoring of endangered sea turtle nesting sites.

Since the Federal Aviation Administration already sent notice of preparing an EA, and if the FAA concludes a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) we request that the agency identify relevant areas of environmental concern, verify that EA supports the agency's determination that the potential impacts will be insignificant, and most importantly, identify mitigation measures that will be sufficient to reduce potential impacts below applicable significance thresholds and has ensured commitments to implement these measures. In other words, a Mitigated FONSI should be issued by the responsible FAA official. Additionally, I request the FAA enforce and/or hold SpaceX accountable to their required mitigation. Not all original 29 conditions from the EIS of 2014 were adhered to by SpaceX.

Roel Cantu
Mission, TX

JANUARY 21, 2021

Re: SpaceX proposal to conduct Starship/Super Heavy launch operations from the Boca Chica Launch Site in Cameron County, Texas.

I urge the FAA to conduct a new EIS for the SpaceX Starship/Super Heavy operations currently underway at SpaceX's Boca Chica site. From the 2014 FEIS, the objective of SpaceX's operations are entirely different, the launch vehicle is entirely different, and the size and scope of SpaceX is entirely different, which potentially in the future may include off-shore launches via superheavy-class spaceports, Superheavy re-landing on the launch stand, and a resort.

An EIS is in the interest of the public's concern to impacts that include accessibility of public lands, public safety, environment, wildlife, habitat, cumulative analysis of impacts, the unique characteristics of the geographic area (e.g., proximity to historic or cultural resources, parks, prime farmlands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers, ecologically critical areas, adverse impacts on endangered or threatened species or critical habitat; impacts that may be both beneficial and adverse. A significant impact may exist even if the Federal agency believes that on balance the impact will be beneficial; the degree to which the effects on the quality of the human environment are likely to be highly controversial; and whether the action is related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant impacts. Significance cannot be avoided by terming an action temporary or by breaking it down into component parts. An EIS most probably will more adequately address the differences and changes to SpaceX's operations. Ultimately, an EIS is needed to predict and mitigate anticipated consequences and prevent unintended consequences of SpaceX's proposals of the Starship program on the region of influence.

FAA should consider not just the "proposed project" and "no action" alternatives, but also other alternatives that include launches of Starship from an offshore platform or moving Starship launches to Cape Canaveral, for which the necessary infrastructure already exists and is situated further away from national wildlife refuge and/or state park land.

A new cumulative analysis needs to be conducted. A 3rd party launch failure analysis is needed due to the proximity of Port Isabel, Long Island Village and potentially three LNG export terminals (Annova LNG, Rio Grande LNG, Texas LNG) within 5 miles of the launch site. Public safety must be

the first and foremost consideration. Additionally, an analysis of the potential impacts to the proposed Jupiter LLC project, a crude upgrading, processing and export facility which includes an offshore loading facility 6 miles offshore. The cumulative analysis should also include impacts to climate change with regards to the value chain of SpaceX's operations (e.g. source of methane which is often fracked, condensing methane to liquid state, burning of fuels, etc.)

Considering the many changes since 2014, a 7 year period, and the scope of the Starship program, a new biological opinion is needed. The Starship is much larger, there will be more testing, more beach closures, and more traffic to SpaceX's facilities that are in an area where endangered wildlife is present. More closures of Boca Chica beach will result in increased inaccessibility to monitoring of endangered sea turtle nesting sites.

Since the Federal Aviation Administration already sent notice of preparing an EA, and if the FAA concludes a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) we request that the agency identify relevant areas of environmental concern, verify that EA supports the agency's determination that the potential impacts will be insignificant, and most importantly, identify mitigation measures that will be sufficient to reduce potential impacts below applicable significance thresholds and has ensured commitments to implement these measures. In other words, a Mitigated FONSI should be issued by the responsible FAA official. Additionally, I request the FAA enforce and/or hold SpaceX accountable to their required mitigation. Not all original 29 conditions from the EIS of 2014 were adhered to by SpaceX.

Sharon Croissant
Laguna Vista, TX

JANUARY 21, 2021

Re: SpaceX proposal to conduct Starship/Super Heavy launch operations from the Boca Chica Launch Site in Cameron County, Texas.

I urge the FAA to conduct a new EIS for the SpaceX Starship/Super Heavy operations currently underway at SpaceX's Boca Chica site. From the 2014 FEIS, the objective of SpaceX's operations are entirely different, the launch vehicle is entirely different, and the size and scope of SpaceX is entirely different, which potentially in the future may include off-shore launches via superheavy-class spaceports, Superheavy re-landing on the launch stand, and a resort.

An EIS is in the interest of the public's concern to impacts that include accessibility of public lands, public safety, environment, wildlife, habitat, cumulative analysis of impacts, the unique characteristics of the geographic area (e.g., proximity to historic or cultural resources, parks, prime farmlands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers, ecologically critical areas, adverse impacts on endangered or threatened species or critical habitat; impacts that may be both beneficial and adverse. A significant impact may exist even if the Federal agency believes that on balance the impact will be beneficial; the degree to which the effects on the quality of the human environment are likely to be highly controversial; and whether the action is related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant impacts. Significance cannot be avoided by terming an action temporary or by breaking it down into component parts. An EIS most probably will more adequately address the differences and changes to SpaceX's operations. Ultimately, an EIS is needed to predict and mitigate anticipated consequences and prevent unintended consequences of SpaceX's proposals of the Starship program on the region of influence.

FAA should consider not just the "proposed project" and "no action" alternatives, but also other alternatives that include launches of Starship from an offshore platform or moving Starship launches to Cape Canaveral, for which the necessary infrastructure already exists and is situated further away from national wildlife refuge and/or state park land.

A new cumulative analysis needs to be conducted. A 3rd party launch failure analysis is needed due to the proximity of Port Isabel, Long Island Village and potentially three LNG export terminals (Annova LNG, Rio Grande LNG, Texas LNG) within 5 miles of the launch site. Public safety must be

the first and foremost consideration. Additionally, an analysis of the potential impacts to the proposed Jupiter LLC project, a crude upgrading, processing and export facility which includes an offshore loading facility 6 miles offshore. The cumulative analysis should also include impacts to climate change with regards to the value chain of SpaceX's operations (e.g. source of methane which is often fracked, condensing methane to liquid state, burning of fuels, etc.)

Considering the many changes since 2014, a 7 year period, and the scope of the Starship program, a new biological opinion is needed. The Starship is much larger, there will be more testing, more beach closures, and more traffic to SpaceX's facilities that are in an area where endangered wildlife is present. More closures of Boca Chica beach will result in increased inaccessibility to monitoring of endangered sea turtle nesting sites.

Since the Federal Aviation Administration already sent notice of preparing an EA, and if the FAA concludes a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) we request that the agency identify relevant areas of environmental concern, verify that EA supports the agency's determination that the potential impacts will be insignificant, and most importantly, identify mitigation measures that will be sufficient to reduce potential impacts below applicable significance thresholds and has ensured commitments to implement these measures. In other words, a Mitigated FONSI should be issued by the responsible FAA official. Additionally, I request the FAA enforce and/or hold SpaceX accountable to their required mitigation. Not all original 29 conditions from the EIS of 2014 were adhered to by SpaceX.

Terence Garrett
Laguna Vista, TX

JANUARY 21, 2021

Re: SpaceX proposal to conduct Starship/Super Heavy launch operations from the Boca Chica Launch Site in Cameron County, Texas.

I urge the FAA to conduct a new EIS for the SpaceX Starship/Super Heavy operations currently underway at SpaceX's Boca Chica site. From the 2014 FEIS, the objective of SpaceX's operations are entirely different, the launch vehicle is entirely different, and the size and scope of SpaceX is entirely different, which potentially in the future may include off-shore launches via superheavy-class spaceports, Superheavy re-landing on the launch stand, and a resort.

An EIS is in the interest of the public's concern to impacts that include accessibility of public lands, public safety, environment, wildlife, habitat, cumulative analysis of impacts, the unique characteristics of the geographic area (e.g., proximity to historic or cultural resources, parks, prime farmlands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers, ecologically critical areas, adverse impacts on endangered or threatened species or critical habitat; impacts that may be both beneficial and adverse. A significant impact may exist even if the Federal agency believes that on balance the impact will be beneficial; the degree to which the effects on the quality of the human environment are likely to be highly controversial; and whether the action is related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant impacts. Significance cannot be avoided by terming an action temporary or by breaking it down into component parts. An EIS most probably will more adequately address the differences and changes to SpaceX's operations. Ultimately, an EIS is needed to predict and mitigate anticipated consequences and prevent unintended consequences of SpaceX's proposals of the Starship program on the region of influence.

FAA should consider not just the "proposed project" and "no action" alternatives, but also other alternatives that include launches of Starship from an offshore platform or moving Starship launches to Cape Canaveral, for which the necessary infrastructure already exists and is situated further away from national wildlife refuge and/or state park land.

A new cumulative analysis needs to be conducted. A 3rd party launch failure analysis is needed due to the proximity of Port Isabel, Long Island Village and potentially three LNG export terminals (Annova LNG, Rio Grande LNG, Texas LNG) within 5 miles of the launch site. Public safety must be

the first and foremost consideration. Additionally, an analysis of the potential impacts to the proposed Jupiter LLC project, a crude upgrading, processing and export facility which includes an offshore loading facility 6 miles offshore. The cumulative analysis should also include impacts to climate change with regards to the value chain of SpaceX's operations (e.g. source of methane which is often fracked, condensing methane to liquid state, burning of fuels, etc.)

Considering the many changes since 2014, a 7 year period, and the scope of the Starship program, a new biological opinion is needed. The Starship is much larger, there will be more testing, more beach closures, and more traffic to SpaceX's facilities that are in an area where endangered wildlife is present. More closures of Boca Chica beach will result in increased inaccessibility to monitoring of endangered sea turtle nesting sites.

Since the Federal Aviation Administration already sent notice of preparing an EA, and if the FAA concludes a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) we request that the agency identify relevant areas of environmental concern, verify that EA supports the agency's determination that the potential impacts will be insignificant, and most importantly, identify mitigation measures that will be sufficient to reduce potential impacts below applicable significance thresholds and has ensured commitments to implement these measures. In other words, a Mitigated FONSI should be issued by the responsible FAA official. Additionally, I request the FAA enforce and/or hold SpaceX accountable to their required mitigation. Not all original 29 conditions from the EIS of 2014 were adhered to by SpaceX.

Teresa Saldivar
Brownsville, TX

JANUARY 21, 2021

Re: SpaceX proposal to conduct Starship/Super Heavy launch operations from the Boca Chica Launch Site in Cameron County, Texas.

I urge the FAA to conduct a new EIS for the SpaceX Starship/Super Heavy operations currently underway at SpaceX's Boca Chica site. From the 2014 FEIS, the objective of SpaceX's operations are entirely different, the launch vehicle is entirely different, and the size and scope of SpaceX is entirely different, which potentially in the future may include off-shore launches via superheavy-class spaceports, Superheavy re-landing on the launch stand, and a resort.

An EIS is in the interest of the public's concern to impacts that include accessibility of public lands, public safety, environment, wildlife, habitat, cumulative analysis of impacts, the unique characteristics of the geographic area (e.g., proximity to historic or cultural resources, parks, prime farmlands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers, ecologically critical areas, adverse impacts on endangered or threatened species or critical habitat; impacts that may be both beneficial and adverse. A significant impact may exist even if the Federal agency believes that on balance the impact will be beneficial; the degree to which the effects on the quality of the human environment are likely to be highly controversial; and whether the action is related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant impacts. Significance cannot be avoided by terming an action temporary or by breaking it down into component parts. An EIS most probably will more adequately address the differences and changes to SpaceX's operations. Ultimately, an EIS is needed to predict and mitigate anticipated consequences and prevent unintended consequences of SpaceX's proposals of the Starship program on the region of influence.

FAA should consider not just the "proposed project" and "no action" alternatives, but also other alternatives that include launches of Starship from an offshore platform or moving Starship launches to Cape Canaveral, for which the necessary infrastructure already exists and is situated further away from national wildlife refuge and/or state park land.

A new cumulative analysis needs to be conducted. A 3rd party launch failure analysis is needed due to the proximity of Port Isabel, Long Island Village and potentially three LNG export terminals (Annova LNG, Rio Grande LNG, Texas LNG) within 5 miles of the launch site. Public safety must be

the first and foremost consideration. Additionally, an analysis of the potential impacts to the proposed Jupiter LLC project, a crude upgrading, processing and export facility which includes an offshore loading facility 6 miles offshore. The cumulative analysis should also include impacts to climate change with regards to the value chain of SpaceX's operations (e.g. source of methane which is often fracked, condensing methane to liquid state, burning of fuels, etc.)

Considering the many changes since 2014, a 7 year period, and the scope of the Starship program, a new biological opinion is needed. The Starship is much larger, there will be more testing, more beach closures, and more traffic to SpaceX's facilities that are in an area where endangered wildlife is present. More closures of Boca Chica beach will result in increased inaccessibility to monitoring of endangered sea turtle nesting sites.

Since the Federal Aviation Administration already sent notice of preparing an EA, and if the FAA concludes a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) we request that the agency identify relevant areas of environmental concern, verify that EA supports the agency's determination that the potential impacts will be insignificant, and most importantly, identify mitigation measures that will be sufficient to reduce potential impacts below applicable significance thresholds and has ensured commitments to implement these measures. In other words, a Mitigated FONSI should be issued by the responsible FAA official. Additionally, I request the FAA enforce and/or hold SpaceX accountable to their required mitigation. Not all original 29 conditions from the EIS of 2014 were adhered to by SpaceX.

Vida Casas
South Padre Island, TX

JANUARY 21, 2021

Re: SpaceX proposal to conduct Starship/Super Heavy launch operations from the Boca Chica Launch Site in Cameron County, Texas.

I urge the FAA to conduct a new EIS for the SpaceX Starship/Super Heavy operations currently underway at SpaceX's Boca Chica site. From the 2014 FEIS, the objective of SpaceX's operations are entirely different, the launch vehicle is entirely different, and the size and scope of SpaceX is entirely different, which potentially in the future may include off-shore launches via superheavy-class spaceports, Superheavy re-landing on the launch stand, and a resort.

An EIS is in the interest of the public's concern to impacts that include accessibility of public lands, public safety, environment, wildlife, habitat, cumulative analysis of impacts, the unique characteristics of the geographic area (e.g., proximity to historic or cultural resources, parks, prime farmlands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers, ecologically critical areas, adverse impacts on endangered or threatened species or critical habitat; impacts that may be both beneficial and adverse. A significant impact may exist even if the Federal agency believes that on balance the impact will be beneficial; the degree to which the effects on the quality of the human environment are likely to be highly controversial; and whether the action is related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant impacts. Significance cannot be avoided by terming an action temporary or by breaking it down into component parts. An EIS most probably will more adequately address the differences and changes to SpaceX's operations. Ultimately, an EIS is needed to predict and mitigate anticipated consequences and prevent unintended consequences of SpaceX's proposals of the Starship program on the region of influence.

FAA should consider not just the "proposed project" and "no action" alternatives, but also other alternatives that include launches of Starship from an offshore platform or moving Starship launches to Cape Canaveral, for which the necessary infrastructure already exists and is situated further away from national wildlife refuge and/or state park land.

A new cumulative analysis needs to be conducted. A 3rd party launch failure analysis is needed due to the proximity of Port Isabel, Long Island Village and potentially three LNG export terminals (Annova LNG, Rio Grande LNG, Texas LNG) within 5 miles of the launch site. Public safety must be

the first and foremost consideration. Additionally, an analysis of the potential impacts to the proposed Jupiter LLC project, a crude upgrading, processing and export facility which includes an offshore loading facility 6 miles offshore. The cumulative analysis should also include impacts to climate change with regards to the value chain of SpaceX's operations (e.g. source of methane which is often fracked, condensing methane to liquid state, burning of fuels, etc.)

Considering the many changes since 2014, a 7 year period, and the scope of the Starship program, a new biological opinion is needed. The Starship is much larger, there will be more testing, more beach closures, and more traffic to SpaceX's facilities that are in an area where endangered wildlife is present. More closures of Boca Chica beach will result in increased inaccessibility to monitoring of endangered sea turtle nesting sites.

Since the Federal Aviation Administration already sent notice of preparing an EA, and if the FAA concludes a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) we request that the agency identify relevant areas of environmental concern, verify that EA supports the agency's determination that the potential impacts will be insignificant, and most importantly, identify mitigation measures that will be sufficient to reduce potential impacts below applicable significance thresholds and has ensured commitments to implement these measures. In other words, a Mitigated FONSI should be issued by the responsible FAA official. Additionally, I request the FAA enforce and/or hold SpaceX accountable to their required mitigation. Not all original 29 conditions from the EIS of 2014 were adhered to by SpaceX.

Virginia Gelineau
Palmview, TX